Sacramento County
Active Transportation Plan:

June 2022,

Funded by Caltrans Sustainable Communities Program,

The front cover shows a pedestrian waiting for the light to turn at a crosswalk, and two bikers in a bike lane, side-by side with a car, waiting for the green light to cross an intersection. The Great Wall of Carmichael—a mural at one of the corners of Carmichael Park facing the street—is seen in the background.

Acknowledgements:

Section opening shows a cyclist riding through a neighborhood street lined with trees.

Ron Vicari,

Director, SacDOT;

Matt Darrow,

Chief of Planning and Programs, SacDOT;

Kevin Bewsey,

Principal Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Refugio Razo,

Senior Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Mikki Mcdaniel,

Senior Planner, SacDOT;

Steve White,

Chief of Engineering, SacDOT;

Melissa Wright,

Principal Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Lupe Rodriguez,

Chief of Operations and Maintenance;

Kamal Atwal,

Principal Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Lu Li,

Principal Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Cameron Shew,

Principal Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Heather Yee,

Senior Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Kenneth Wick,

Senior Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Bill Irving,

Associate Civil Engineer, SacDOT;

Benjamin Rady,

Associate Planner, SacDOT;

Kiara Movido,

Intern, SacDOT;

Liz Bellas,

Director of Regional Parks;

James Boyle,

Director of Planning, Sacramento Regional Transit;

James Drake,

Principal Planner, Sacramento Regional Transit;

Kristi Grabow,

Planning and Environmental Review;

Josh Greetan,

Planning and Environmental Review;

Thomas Cassera, Dave Comerchero, Robert Goss, Pat Perez, Sue Schooley, Jack Wursten,

SacBAC;

Gene Lozano, Chair; Bill Fallai, Scott Harger, Randy Hicks, Mahavir “Kalli” Kallirai, Carol Moss, Kathy Sachen, Jeff Tardaguila,

Sacramento County Disability Advisory Commission (DAC) Physical Access Subcommittee;

Jennifer Donlon-Wyant,

Transportation Planning Manager, City of Sacramento;

Edgar Medina,

Principal Civil Engineer, City of Rancho Cordova;

Byron Tang,

Senior Civil Engineer, City of Rancho Cordova;

Casey Kempenaar,

City of Citrus Heights;

Leslie Blomquist,

City of Citrus Heights;

Carrie Whitlock,

City of Elk Grove;

Brett Bollinger,

City of Folsom;

Alex Padilla,

Caltrans District 3;

Edward Lincoln,

Caltrans District 3;

Prepared by:

Alta, DKS, WALK Sacramento.

Contents:

Executive Summary,
Page 1;

Chapter 1: Introduction, Vision, and Goals,
Page 4;

Chapter 2: Existing Conditions,
Page 14;

Chapter 3: Public Engagement,
Page 64;

Chapter 4: Infrastructure Recommendations,
Page 74;

Chapter 5: Program Recommendations,
Page 138;

Chapter 6: Implementation and Funding,
Page 154.

Appendices:

See separate document.

Executive Summary:

Chapter cover has a group of cyclists who appear to be biking a marathon, through an off-street trail densely packed with trees.

Goals:

The 2022 Active Transportation Plan for unincorporated Sacramento County is a tool for guiding County staff, public officials, residents, and developers to build a balanced transportation system that supports and encourages active modes of travel. Active

transportation includes walking, biking, and rolling (mobility devices, skateboards, scooters, etc.). The primary purpose of this Plan is to promote and encourage people to choose walking, biking, and rolling through the creation of safe, comfortable, connected, and accessible walking, rolling and biking networks, encourage alternatives to single-occupancy vehicle trips and improve access to transit. Specifically, this plan seeks to:

- Create safe and comfortable places for residents, workers, and visitors to walk, bike, and roll.
- Provide active transportation access to neighborhood destinations and neighboring cities and counties.
- Prioritize active transportation improvements in communities that rely on walking, biking, rolling, and public transportation.
- Maintain the active transportation network in a state of good repair.
- Support and expand educational programs that support walking, biking, and rolling.
- Implement the recommended infrastructure projects using all available funding sources.

This Plan provides a prioritization method to implement infrastructure recommendations in a phased, manageable way. This Plan will replace the Pedestrian Master Plan (2007) and the Bikeway Master Plan (2011) within the Sacramento County General Plan.

Investing in improvements to countywide walking and bicycling networks creates lasting impacts on both individuals and their communities. Developing safe, comfortable, and accessible physical environments has been shown to:

- Increase the livability and quality of life of an area.
- Increase recreational opportunities through improved access to our spaces and amenities.
- Decrease the risk of pedestrian- and bicycle-involved injuries.

- Provide affordable transportation options for low-income and disadvantaged residents.
- Reduce visual and noise pollution from automobiles.
- Support improved access to public transportation.
- Improve air quality through reductions in vehicle miles traveled and reduction in single-occupancy vehicle trips.

Many existing and proposed projects will continue to transform Sacramento County's local and regional transportation environment. As both infrastructure and travel patterns shift from new developments and changing office environments, there is potential to build infrastructure more supportive of neighborhood trips. The recommendations proposed in this Plan lay the foundation for a more active, connected, accessible, and safer Sacramento County.

Recommendations:

The County developed the 2022 Active Transportation Plan through a robust community engagement process. Throughout two engagement phases, the County engaged with hundreds of residents and received thousands of online interactions from County stakeholders. The engagement process led to recommendations of 194 pedestrian improvement locations, 192 miles of sidewalk gap closures, 1,218 miles of bicycle facilities, and a collection of policy and programmatic recommendations.

The County prioritized infrastructure projects for implementation based on the following factors:

- Safety and comfort,
- Connectivity and access,
- Equity,
- Project complexity,

The ATP ranked all recommendations, then determined a priority network which includes 55 pedestrian spot improvement locations, 32 miles of sidewalk gap closures, and 185 miles of bicycle recommendations. Priority network projects directly respond to the safety, connectivity, comfort, and equity concerns raised through the needs analysis and community engagement process. Many prioritized projects fall on either the pedestrian- or bicycle-high injury network, directly responding to safety needs, or close a vital gap/remove a barrier to walking, biking, and rolling in unincorporated Sacramento County.

Prioritized projects are one piece of the overall active transportation network; the Plan also provides recommendations on programs in multiple categories: education, encouragement, support, safe routes to school, evaluation, and infrastructure.

These improvements across the County supporting active modes will transform the transportation environment, making it safer, more practical, and more enjoyable to walk, bike, or roll around Sacramento County.

Chapter 1: Introduction, Vision, and Goals:

Chapter cover has a traffic enforcer holding a “SLOW” sign, as a group of kids with backpacks bike and walk on the side of the road, perhaps on the way to or coming from school.

Vision:

The 2022 Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan for unincorporated Sacramento County aims to improve the safety, health, and quality of life of people who

live, work, and play in unincorporated Sacramento County through transportation infrastructure, programs, and policy improvements. These enhance the safety, comfort, and practicality of walking, biking, and rolling for people of all ages and abilities.

Purpose:

The 2022 Plan is Sacramento County's first active transportation plan. The Plan focuses on walking, biking, and rolling (wheeled mobility devices used by people with disabilities, strollers, scooters, skateboards, etc.). The Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan (ATP) analyzes existing conditions and provides policy, program, and infrastructure recommendations to improve active transportation within unincorporated Sacramento County. Throughout the development of the Plan, community members shared their experiences, challenges, and vision of walking, biking, and rolling across the County. The ATP will:

- Recommend infrastructure improvements for people who walk, bike, and roll.
- Propose new routes for people who walk, bike, and roll.
- Work towards making walking, biking, and rolling easier, safer, and more comfortable for people of all ages and abilities.

The County recognizes the importance of regional connectivity and has coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions to foster compatibility with other planning efforts and improve connectivity and access across the entire County. The Plan does not provide recommendations within the County's seven incorporated cities: Citrus Heights, Elk Grove, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, Rancho Cordova, and Sacramento City.

Plan Development:

The County developed the ATP over seven phases to gain approval and begin implementation. Each phase built upon the analysis and community feedback from the prior phases. The timeline in Figure 01 lists each stage and when it occurred during the Plan's development.

The Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan development was closely coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions, local cities, and regional entities. The project team reviewed over 14 planning documents and policies from Sacramento County and neighboring jurisdictions (see "Plan and Policy Review" beginning on page 17). The County coordinated with neighboring jurisdictions throughout the process. In the first engagement phase, the County hosted a "County Agencies" stakeholder meeting with staff from multiple jurisdictions. The County also held individual meetings with the City of Rancho Cordova, Sacramento County Regional Transit, and the City of Citrus Heights (see "Stakeholder Meeting and Pop-up Summaries" beginning on page 284 of Appendix B). The County sent project recommendations to neighboring jurisdictions for review. Comments from neighboring jurisdictions can be found in Tables B-2 and B-3, beginning on page 344 of Appendix B. Any comments from the public about neighboring jurisdictions were collected and passed along to the appropriate entity.

Figure 1: Plan Development:

Wherein Public Involvement included the Technical Advisory Committee, stakeholders, and general public.

Phase 1, Spring 2020: Existing Conditions Analysis.
Phase 2, Summer/Winter 2020: Needs Analysis.
Phase 3, Winter 2020/Summer 2021: Recommendations.
Phase 4, Summer/Fall 2021: Draft Plan.
Phase 5, Fall/Winter 2021: Draft Plan Review at Planning Commission & Board of Supervisors.

Phase 6, Spring 2022: Environmental Document/Public Comment.

Phase 7, Fall 2022: Final Plan Adoption.

2022 Onwards: Begin Implementation!

Climate Change:

The ATP works towards many of the goals and measures of Sacramento County's Climate Action Plan (2021). Implementing infrastructure, policies, and programs from the ATP is one of the tools that Sacramento County can use to follow through on Climate Action Plan measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from community-wide activities and government operations by 2030. The Plan supports the following measures from the Climate Action Plan:

- Measure GHG-11: Reduce emissions from new residential and office/ business professional development vehicle miles traveled (VMT).The County will achieve a 15% reduction in daily VMT compared to the regional average for all new residential and office/business professional development in the County.
- Measure GHG-15: Improved pedestrian networks and facilities. The County will update the Pedestrian Master Plan to reduce barriers to walking and increase mobility for all users of the roadways.
- Measure GHG-17: Improved bicycle network and facilities. The County will improve the bicycle network to provide for safe and convenient bicycle travel through implementation of the Bicycle Master Plan and the improvement of bicycle infrastructure.

Goals and Objectives:

The goals and objectives of the ATP reflect the priorities expressed by the community throughout the public engagement process. Through discussions with the Sacramento

County Bicycle Advisory Committee (SacBAC) and Disability Advisory Commission and listening to the community throughout the engagement process, the County established four goals based on community priorities and their vision for the future. Each goal includes a set of specific implementation measures. These goals and objectives guide infrastructure and program recommendations and the work of County staff to improve livability and active transportation safety, connectivity, comfort, and practicality across Sacramento County.

Goal 1: Safety and Comfort:

Sacramento County will be a safe and comfortable place for all people to walk, bike, and roll.

Implementation Measures:

- Increase walking and biking commute trips annually by 100% of 2010 numbers (2010 trips are about 4,000 and 4,500 trips respectively) for all trips by 2030.
- Invest in new or upgraded bicycle and pedestrian facilities that increase the level of comfort and safety for people of all ages and abilities.
- Increase the safety and comfort for people walking, bicycling, and rolling along high-injury corridors.
- Provide safety enhancements at major intersections near important community destinations, such as schools, parks, and transit stops.
- Reduce the number of severe injuries and fatalities involving people walking, bicycling, and rolling through infrastructure, education, and encouragement programs. Direct education programs at all roadway users, people walking, biking, rolling, and driving.

- Reduce bicycle- and pedestrian- involved collisions and injuries by 50% of 2010 levels (2010: 208 collisions) by 2030.
- Increase tree canopy coverage (percent of land covered) over pedestrian and bicycle facilities across unincorporated communities.
- Improve lighting in neighborhoods and along designated walking and biking routes.
- Create a comfortable and aesthetically interesting street environment for people walking, biking, and rolling.
- Strive to adopt innovations in design and engineering and participate in new best practices from federal, state, regional and local leaders in active transportation.
- Monitor bicycle and pedestrian collision data to identify trends and specific problem areas.
- Provide walking, bicycling, and rolling amenities (e.g., water fountains, shade trees, benches, lighting, parking) at key destinations such as job centers, transit stops, and parks.

Goal 2: Connectivity and Access:

Sacramento County residents will have access to neighborhood destinations by walking, bicycling, and rolling and can seamlessly connect to networks in incorporated cities; Sacramento County residents will travel more by active transportation modes.

Implementation Measures:

- Ensure walking, bicycling, and rolling routes connect to both neighborhood-serving destinations—such as schools, libraries, parks, and transit stations—and regional destinations such as job centers and major commercial areas.

- Make bicycling more attractive than driving for short trips of five miles or less by developing and maintaining a bikeway system that provides direct, safe, and convenient travel by active transportation throughout neighborhoods in Sacramento County with connections to adjacent municipalities.
- Eliminate gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian networks to improve connectivity and physical access between neighborhoods and destinations.
- Implement the Sacramento County ADA Transition Plan (2020). Refer to the ADA transition Plan available on the County's website for more details.
- Use Universal Design Principles when designing separated and/or protected bikeways to ensure curb accessibility for people taking transit or paratransit and for people of all abilities who need direct curb access. Design Principles may include providing transit boarding islands, designing buffer areas that are wide enough to allow loading and unloading from vehicles (including transit and paratransit vehicles), and providing connections to safe crossing points that provide sidewalk access.
- Integrate land use and transportation planning to provide for more, safer, and accessible walking and bicycling trips.
- Provide connections across creeks, railroad crossings and rivers, freeways, and high-speed/high volume arterials and through existing gated communities, walls, and cul-de-sacs to access schools, activity centers, and transit stops.
- Provide safe and secure bike parking and other end-of-trip facilities at key destinations such as job centers, transit stops, and parks.
- Collaborate with local jurisdictions within the County as well as adjacent counties and SACOG to integrate existing active transportation facilities

and cooperate in developing new facilities to create a uniform, physically accessible and connected active transportation network.

- Develop a regional active transportation wayfinding system that allows all people, regardless of ability, to easily navigate major destinations and trail systems.
- Through partnerships with community groups and coordination with local and regional agencies, develop programs, including Safe Routes to School, that promote and encourage active transportation as a viable means of travel throughout the County.
- Promote Sacramento County's 3 1 1 system for the public to suggest locations for new bikeways and walkways on an on-going basis.
- Consider implementing a shared micromobility program to increase low-cost and environmentally-friendly transportation options within the County. This program should be implemented equitably across Environmental Justice areas and other locations with high contractions of people walking and bicycling.
- Study developing mobility hubs near SacRT light rail stations, high-ridership bus stops, and other high-demand walking, bicycling, and rolling areas.

Goal 3: Equity:

Active transportation improvements will prioritize the needs of communities in Sacramento County that rely on walking, biking, rolling, and transit.

Implementation Measures:

- Improve the safety and security of people walking, bicycling, and rolling in rural parts of the County, historically disadvantaged communities, and areas of concern for people with disabilities.
- Focus on improving active transportation connections to transit stops and community destinations, giving priority to connections in disadvantaged communities.
- Partner with community and advocacy groups to provide educational resources (for all road users) and walking and biking accessories (lights, helmets, etc.) to disadvantaged communities.
- Create accessible and culturally appropriate opportunities for all people regardless of race, color, national origin, disability, age, sexual orientation, or income to engage in the decision-making process.
- Coordinate with the ADA Transition Plan (2020) to maximize opportunities to create universally accessible sidewalks, intersections, and transit stops.

Goal 4: Maintenance:

Keep the active transportation network in a state of good repair and high usability.

Implementation Measures:

- Develop a multi-year maintenance and rehabilitation program that identifies cost-effective enhancements to existing or missing pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- Coordinate with maintenance stakeholders across departments and jurisdictions to share resources and establish facility inspection schedules.
- Maintain (including street sweeping) designated facilities to be comfortable and free of hazards to people walking, bicycling, and rolling.
- Prioritize clean-up responses to hazards on commute corridors.

- Ensure that the repair and construction of transportation facilities minimize disruption to the bicycling and walking environment. Walking and bicycling facilities will be reconstructed in the same or better condition than prior to construction or repairs. When closures or detours are necessary, provide or clearly indicate where accessible alternatives are located.
- Monitor and maintain bicycle parking and other support facilities.
- Promote Sacramento County's 3 1 1 system for the public to report hazard and maintenance issues throughout the County.
- Develop a communication protocol for facility closures/detours and network updates.
- Develop and enforce a sidewalk maintenance program to ensure that adjacent property owners properly maintain the sidewalks (consistent with the County's Curb, Gutter, and Sidewalk Repair and Replacement Policy, 1992).

Goal 5: Educate and Encourage:

Expand established education and encouragement programs, and develop new education programs to encourage and support walking and bicycling.

Implementation Measures:

- Expand established outreach programs by securing ongoing funding, and expand and develop new education programs (for people walking, biking, rolling, and driving).
- Expand and support education programs targeted at people driving, including commercial drivers.
- Promote educational and encouragement programs using community-specific messaging using all relevant communication mediums including

local media, social media, print collateral, email lists, and partnerships with community-based groups.

- Work with the County's Department of Health Services on increasing physical fitness and working towards other public health objectives.
- Work with Sacramento County schools and school districts to expand the Safe Routes to School Program. Encourage bicycle and walking education classes for students and their families.
- Promote active transportation-related events and new facilities through local new media, and other relevant stakeholder groups.
- Apply for recognition as Bicycle Friendly Community as determined by the League of American Bicyclists.
- Support programs that help low-income residents own and operate a road-ready bicycle.
- Support bicycle parking (bike valet) at major events and event centers.
- Provide encouragement programs by seeking grant funding and other funding sources.
- Support and expand programs that promote shared micromobility programs and help residents access, afford, and learn how to use the program/programs.

Goal 6: Implementation:

Active transportation projects will be implemented across Sacramento County through street maintenance and improvements, private development, and external grant funded projects.

Implementation Measures:

- Continue to allocate Capital Improvement Plan funding and other County resources to implementing bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Actively seek new grant funding for bicycle and pedestrian facility planning, design, and implementation.
- Assess the use of developer fees and/or improvement districts, and enforce fee submittal and compliance to contribute to improved active transportation facilities.
- Require land development projects to finance and install bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the development as appropriate and where recommended in the Active Transportation Plan. These practices will ensure connectivity within the development and to existing or planned facilities that connect to the development.
- Encourage bicycle parking, showers, changing facilities, and lockers at public and private buildings.
- Prioritize pedestrian amenities at areas near transit stops and key community destinations (schools, parks, libraries, etc.).
- Conduct bicycle and pedestrian counts at selected locations annually (during the same days and times) to monitor changes in bicycle and pedestrian trips.
- Measure the success of the Active Transportation Plan through user satisfaction surveys.
- Track and report annually to SacBAC the success of the Active Transportation Plan based on bicycle lane miles and pedestrian projects.

Chapter 2: Existing Conditions:

Chapter cover shows a pedestrian walking on a sidewalk, adjacent to a grassy lot on one side, and a street lined with commercial buildings on the other.

A quote from Anna Fairehrenreich, stay-at-home mom, age 34, South Sacramento County resident for 6 years, is shared:

“The Active Transportation Plan would benefit my family and I by getting our streets safe enough to walk and feel secure in choosing to walk over driving. Also, exciting places to walk to would help encourage and uplift our community [to be] less reliant on fossil fuels to enjoy everyday life.”

Accompanying this quote, Anna is featured giving a ride to one of her toddlers on her shoulders, with her hand over her pregnant belly.

Walking and biking are closely linked to health and economic benefits (Footnote 1)

- Increased physical fitness and health,
- Low-or no-cost transportation options,
- Access to community assets and destinations (such as parks, schools, health care, shopping),
- Reduced congestion and parking costs,
- Increased individual mobility,
- Connectivity and visibility of local businesses,
- Vibrant and welcoming streetscapes,

Footnote 1: From Cullen McCormick, “York Blvd: The Economics of a Road Diet,” (2012)

Featured here is green infrastructure, sidewalks, and a speed feedback sign on Florin Road near Kanelos Lane.

Plan and Policy Review:

A person biking along the Florin Creek Trail is shown.

Current active transportation documentation, plans, and policies that the future Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan will influence and be influenced by have been reviewed. Each document differs in overarching focus and approach related to the most relevant active transportation needs in the area, however general commonalities are present.

Goals and Performance Measures:

The following goals are consistent between many long-range planning and bicycle and pedestrian planning documents throughout the region with access, mobility, connectivity, safety, education, encouragement, and awareness being the most common goals.

- Provide a connected pedestrian and bicycle network throughout the jurisdiction.
- Improve and/or enhance safety of people walking and bicycling.
- Reduce emissions caused by vehicle travel.
- Provide education to all residents, including people driving, walking and bicycling.

- Support the enforcement of safety for all roadway users, including people walking and bicycling.
- Acquire sufficient funding by identifying federal, state and local sources.

A summary of Focus and Goal Categories found across regional and local plans is shown in Table 01.

The various plans were relatively inconsistent in their identification of goals, focus areas, objectives, strategies, policies, and implementation actions, however there were often common topics that were repeated across many of the plans. A full matrix of policies and actions found across the regional and local plans is included as an appendix to this document. The common topics generally relate back to the following:

- Invest in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure as healthy transportation options.
- Improve safety for people walking and bicycling.
- Increase and improve access to employment, economic centers, and environmental justice communities.
- Establish and expand on education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation programs.
- Improve access to transit.
- Collaborate with nearby jurisdictions to support a regional bicycle network.
- Prioritize projects that improve access to environmental justice communities, improve safety, close gaps in the network, and low cost or privately funded improvements.

Several active transportation documents adopted in the region have policies, goals or actions to implement active transportation related programs. These programs may include education, encouragement, enforcement, and/or evaluation. However, the actual implementation or expansion of these programs is difficult to determine, or not documented.

Table 01: Goals and Focus Areas of Prior Planning Efforts:

Categories/Goals will be listed under each of the 14 prior planning efforts.

1. SACOG:

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Multimodal Transportation.

2. Regional Bike/Ped/Trail Plan:

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Quality and Operation;
    - Safety;
    - Increase Mode Share;
    - Network Expansion;
    - Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
    - Comprehensive Countywide;
    - Collaboration/Partnership;
    - Data Collection.

3. Sacramento (County) Bike Plan (2011):

    - Safety;
    - Increase Mode Share;
    - Network Expansion;
    - Funding/Finance/Cost Effectiveness.

4. Sacramento (County) Ped Plan (2007):

- Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
- Safety;
- Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
- Funding/Finance/Cost Effectiveness;
- ADA Accessibility;
- Streetscaping, Context, and Land Use.

5. Countywide ADA Transition Plan (2020):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Quality and Operation;
    - Safety;
    - Network Expansion;
    - Comprehensive Countywide;
    - Data Collection;
    - ADA Accessibility;
    - Equity;
    - Opportunities;
    - Phasing;
    - Implementation and Maintenance.

6. Sacramento (City) Bike Plan (2016):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Safety;
    - Increase Mode Share;
    - Equity.

7. Sacramento (City) Ped Plan (2006):

- Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
- Safety;
- Collaboration/Partnership;
- Streetscaping, Context, and Land Use.

8. Citrus Heights Bike Plan (2015):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Safety;
    - Increase Mode Share;
    - Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
    - Funding/Finance/Cost Effectiveness;
    - Streetscaping, Context, and Land Use;
    - Commuting;
    - Enforcement;
    - Environmental/Development.

9. Citrus Heights Ped Plan (2016):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Safety;
    - Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
    - Data Collection;
    - Streetscaping, Context, and Land Use.

10. Rancho Cordova Bike Plan (2016):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Safety;

- Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
- Funding/Finance/Cost Effectiveness.

11. Galt Bike Plan (2011):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Safety;
    - Network Expansion;
    - Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
    - Collaboration/Partnership;
    - Funding/Finance/Cost Effectiveness;
    - Routes to Schools.

12. Folsom Bike Plan (2007):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Multimodal Transportation;
    - Safety;
    - Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
    - Collaboration/Partnership;
    - Funding/Finance/Cost Effectiveness;
    - Environmental/Development;
    - Opportunities;
    - Phasing;
    - Support Facilities;
    - Implementation and Maintenance.

13. Folsom Ped Plan (2014):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;

- Safety;
- Network Expansion;
- Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
- Streetscaping, Context, and Land Use;
- Consistency between Plans.

14. Elk Grove Bike, Ped, and Trails Plan (2021):

    - Access/Mobility/Connectivity;
    - Increase Mode Share;
    - Education, Encouragement and Awareness;
    - Enforcement;
    - Roadway Design.

Active transportation in a rural setting is also an area of weakness in active transportation plans in the region. Very low density creates a network void of connected facilities and requires long distances to travel to reach destinations. As a result, the pedestrian mode share is far lower than suburban areas. The bicycle mode share suffers as well as most facilities that do exist are located on high speed, narrow roadways.

There are ample opportunities in suburban areas of the County to improve connectivity. Both pedestrian and bicycle networks can be expanded to ensure gapless connections to transit routes and create desirable routes to destinations within walking distances of various destinations. Active transportation in the County would be made further desirable by offering support facilities such as water fountains for people walking and dedicated bicycle parking facilities for people bicycling at key destinations.

This extensive review of active transportation documents is considered a baseline understanding for the goals and objectives that the Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan will need to address. Also, pointing out the differences and shortcomings between plans in the region will support the success of this plan.

Unincorporated Sacramento County Overview:

Figure 02: A map of incorporated cities and unincorporated cities is included.

PLAN AREA OVERVIEW:

This Active Transportation Plan covers the unincorporated areas of Sacramento County (Figure 02). Sacramento County is located in the middle of the 400-mile long Central Valley, 87 miles east of San Francisco, and 100 miles west of Lake Tahoe. Sacramento County has seven incorporated cities: Sacramento, Elk Grove, Citrus Heights, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, and Rancho Cordova. The County also contains a number of mature and new communities in the unincorporated area. Encompassing a total of 994 square miles, the County surrounds Interstate 80 (I-80) and US Route 50 (US 50) east of Yolo County and Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route 99 (SR 99) north of San Joaquin County and east of Solano County. The County's unincorporated area is 764 square miles or about 80% of the total area.

Figure 02: A map of Unincorporated Sacramento County is shown. Incorporated Cities are also shown, and shaded differently.

The unincorporated County is mostly developed and densely populated along the I-80 and US 50 corridors and along parts of the SR 99 corridor. The remainder of the unincorporated County is more sparsely populated with agricultural uses or undeveloped land.

The unincorporated areas of Sacramento County have a population of 592,911 (2019), which is approximately 40% of the total population of the County. (Footnote 2) The unincorporated population has grown 5.3% since the 2010 Census, and the median age for the entire county has increased from 34.8 to 36.6 over the last ten years.

Footnote 2: United States Census American Community Survey (ACS), 2018.

Shown here is the River Road and the Sacramento River.

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITIES:

The Sacramento County General Plan Environmental Justice (EJ) Element (2019) identified EJ Communities that are considered disadvantaged compared to other parts of the unincorporated County. Focusing on EJ Communities allows the County to identify increased health risks and other environmental justice issues, including transportation, these residents experience. The EJ Element used the California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen 3.0) and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS) to identify disadvantaged communities based on socioeconomic and environmental characteristics.

A man waits to cross the street on Watt Avenue.

The four designated EJ Communities are North Highlands, West Arden-Arcade, South Sacramento, and North Vineyard. These communities are shown in Figure 03.

A placemaking entry sign in Arden-Arcade is displayed.

Next, Figure 03 is shown, which is a map highlighting Environmental Justice Communities.

Median household income is much lower in the EJ Communities than in other unincorporated communities in Sacramento County. While all four County EJ Communities have relatively similar land areas, South Sacramento is the densest community with 67,362 residents. North Vineyards is the least dense, with only 1,733 residents and primarily rural agricultural land uses. Across the entire County, the areas with the highest population density are within unincorporated areas. Multiple neighborhoods within the South Sacramento area and communities within and around North Highlands are denser than any of the incorporated cities. The Arden-Arcade area is also one of the ten most dense areas of the County. Looking only at unincorporated areas, EJ Communities tend to have higher population densities than non-EJ Communities.

Sacramento County's EJ Communities are a focus throughout this Active Transportation Plan. Transportation issues are intertwined with many of the concerns of EJ Community residents:

- Lack of connected, comfortable, and low-stress walking and bicycling infrastructure.
- Poor access to healthy food.
- Minimal physical activity.
- Poor access to public facilities like parks, libraries, services, medical offices, and schools.
- Exposure to air pollution.
- Lack of tree canopy.

FUTURE POPULATION AND JOB GROWTH:

Many parts of unincorporated Sacramento County are experiencing growth, responding to high demand for additional housing and jobs. The County expects most future growth to occur in master planned communities (in various planning and development phases). (Footnote 3) New developments will result in the potential for increased vehicle trips to and from these areas, and connecting these areas to the larger walking and bicycle networks (as well as transit) can facilitate walking, biking, and rolling trips and reduce automobile dependence for workers and residents of these areas. Sacramento County has approved eight Master Plan/ Specific Plan areas (Figure 04) for future residential and commercial development which include Florin Vineyard, Vineyard Station, Vineyard Springs, Cordova Hills, Glenborough, Easton, Mather South, and New Bridge.

Footnote 3: Sacramento County expects most growth to happen within Master Plan development areas. However, data from SACOG suggests that there may also be additional infill growth in other areas of the County. Analysis of future growth for this plan relies on County data showing the majority of growth in the Master Plan areas.

Shown here is Figure 04: A map of the Master Plan Areas, highlighting Easton Place, Cordova Hills, Mather South, New Bridge, Florin Vineyard, North Vineyard Station, and Vineyard Springs.

Many of the master plan areas are within the North Vineyard EJ Community. Other master plan developments are in more eastern parts of the County, east of Rancho Cordova.

Population and job growth will not be limited to those master plan areas. Population and job growth models from the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) predict

population and job growth throughout the unincorporated County (Figure 05 and Figure 06), especially in the South Sacramento and north-central parts of the County (the area between the City of Sacramento and Folsom). There are also multiple pockets of projected dense job growth along the Sacramento Regional Transit light rail corridors.

Figure 05: A Population Density map showing the projected loss and growth in population by the year 2040 is included.

Similarly, Figure 06: a Job Growth map by the year 2040 is shown, identifying areas that experience no change, a loss in job opportunities, or job growth. (A scale is included, from less growth to more growth, to help specify the job growth level of an area).

TRAVEL PATTERNS:

Based on the 2019 ACS (Footnote 4), there are approximately 270,600 workers 16 years or older in unincorporated Sacramento County. The majority of workers commute by car, either alone (77.2%) or carpooling (10.2%), while 1% walk to work and fewer than 0.5% commute by bicycling. People taking transit represents 2.5% of workforce and over 8% work from home. The average commute time for all workers is 28 minutes (Figure 07).

While most unincorporated residents use cars to get to work, walking and biking have a more prominent role for neighborhood-focused trips. SACOG regional data indicates that about 9% of all-purpose trips are completed by walking and biking, which has increased from 7% in 2000. These local trips include people walking and biking to schools, parks, libraries, stores, community centers, and other essential services and neighborhood destinations.

Footnote 4: Based on the total workers in Sacramento County minus the workers in each incorporated City.

Figure 07: Commute Mode Share and Travel Time:

Mode share for workers 16 years and older in Sacramento County: (Presented alongside overall data from California)

Driver Alone:

- 77% of Sacramento County.
- 74% of California.

Carpool:

- 10% of Sacramento County.
- 10% of California.

Walk:

- Less than 1% of Sacramento County.
- 3% of California.

Bicycle:

- Less than 1% of Sacramento County.
- Less than 1% of California.

Transit:

- 3% of Sacramento County.
- 5% of California.

Other:

- 10% of Sacramento County.
- 7% of California.

The average commute time for all workers is 28 minutes.

Based on the SACOG Travel Demand Model, South Sacramento, West Arden-Arcade, and North Highlands have the highest current densities of trips under five miles in length in the unincorporated County. These relatively short trips are key opportunities to convert car trips to walking or biking trips with a safe and comfortable active transportation network. This is shown in Figure 08.

Shown is a bike lane on Power Inn Road, entering the Florin Neighborhood, north of Geneva Pointe Drive.

Next is Figure 08: A map showing the Concentration of Trips Less Than Five Miles.

PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION:

Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) buses and light rail run throughout the County, with a total annual ridership of about 21 million passengers in 2019. Across the County, SacRT has over 5,000 bus stops; about 1,050 bus stops (21%) are within unincorporated Sacramento County. The light rail carries an average of 40,000 trips per day, SacRT buses carry 37,000 passengers per day (weekday average). Most light rail routes run within the City of Sacramento; however, the Gold Line runs along Folsom Boulevard between Sacramento and Folsom, with five stops in unincorporated areas.

Those stations are Watt/Manlove, Starfire, Tiber, Butterfield, and Hazel. In addition to those Gold Line stations, residents near South Sacramento may also use the Blue Line that, in this segment, generally runs north-south.

A SacRT bus stopped on Morse Avenue is shown. The bus stop includes a shelter.

Improving walking, biking, and rolling access to bus and light rail stations will make it easier and more comfortable for transit riders to reach stops. The improvements, combined with projects previously identified by the ADA Transition Plan, can also potentially generate additional riders by providing practical options to walk, bike, or roll to and from the transit stop. In addition to sidewalks, trails, and bicycle facility improvements, stop amenities (benches, trash cans, shelters, etc.) can enhance the streetscape and create a more pleasant place for transit riders to wait for their vehicle away from elements. SacRT's system map can be seen in Figure 09.

Amador Transit Route 1 also provides connection between Amador County and Rancho Murieta and South County Transit (SCT Link) which has three lines connecting Galt to Isleton, Sacramento, and Elk Grove; and one Dial-a-Ride route serving Galt and Herald.

A Fair Oaks Boulevard bike lane next to a Carmichael Park bus stop is shown.

After which, Figure 09: A Public Transportation map, is provided, identifying the bus route and bus stops, as well as the route and stops of the Gold Line, Blue Line, and Green Line. Amtrak Stations are also plotted.

Active Transportation Network:

The active transportation network in Sacramento County consists of sidewalks, bikeways, and shared use paths (trails), along with amenities that improve safety, comfort, and convenience for people biking or walking.

A sidewalk with a rolled curb along Marconi Avenue is exhibited.

SIDEWALKS:

Sidewalks provide dedicated space for people walking and using mobility devices to travel (Figure 10). Sidewalks are raised from the roadway and sometimes have a planting strip to increase separation from the car and provide greenery and potentially shade trees. Sidewalks are separated from the roadway by a curb. There are two types of curbs, rolled and vertical. Rolled curbs are sloped and can allow vehicles to park partially on the sidewalk, typically accommodating vehicle parking on narrow roads. This behavior can obstruct the travel path for people walking or rolling. Vertical curbs rise straight up to the sidewalk level and do not facilitate sidewalk mounting. Vertical curbs are the current standard within Sacramento County.

EXISTING SIDEWALK TYPES:

Figure 10. Sidewalk and Curb Types:

Vertical Curbs:

> Curbs rise straight up to the sidewalk level and are the current standard within Sacramento County.

Rolled Curbs:

> Curbs are sloped and can allow vehicles to encroach onto the sidewalk, providing more roadway width at the expense of pedestrian pathway conflicts.

Attached Sidewalks:

> Connect directly to the curb and provide minimal lateral separation from the roadway.

Detached Sidewalks:

> Separated from the curb with a buffer area, typically a planting strip or special paving material to provide greater separation from the roadway.

There are roughly 1,100 miles of roads throughout unincorporated Sacramento County. Only 13% of those roads have sidewalks on both sides of the street (Figure 11). Twenty-one percent of streets have sidewalks on one side of the street, while 66% of streets have no sidewalks. Combined, 87% of roads either have no sidewalks or sidewalks only on one side of the street. The concentration of sidewalks varies by community across the County. Sidewalks are generally complete on both sides of the road in the northern and central parts of unincorporated County which are more urbanized. Sidewalks are inconsistent and missing more frequently in unincorporated areas south of the City of Elk Grove, due to the rural nature of the southeast area of the County. Most roads in the North Highlands and South Sacramento communities have connected sidewalks. However, significant sidewalks gaps are present in the West Arden-Arcade and North Vineyard EJ Communities. Walking along streets without sidewalks or needing to access destinations on the side of the street without them places people walking closer to moving vehicles with no barrier or grade separation. These are stressful experiences for people walking and are not conducive to making walking a comfortable, practical option for most residents.

In addition to sidewalks, many other infrastructure components contribute to the pedestrian environment. Crosswalks, curb ramps, trails, crossing enhancements, lighting, tree canopy, street furniture, bus shelters, and other streetscape items can affect the safety, comfort, and routing decisions of people walking (and taking

transit). Many of these items contribute to people's perceived safety and actual safety, both in terms of traffic safety and personal safety. Items like street furniture (benches, trash cans, etc.) and bus shelters make streets more comfortable, practical places to be. The placement of street furniture and utilities needs to ensure sufficient clear space to maintain accessibility. Most people perceive an attractive walking environment as both safe and comfortable.

A person is shown walking on a sidewalk with a vertical curb on Florin Road near SR-99.

In Figure 11, a map of Existing Sidewalks is presented. Sidewalk inventory was conducted in 2019. Only sidewalk segments longer than 250 feet are shown.

Pedestrian Experience:

Included here is a signalized school crossing of Calvine Road at Cliffcrest Drive.

Crossing the street, especially large-multilane streets, at mid-block locations or across slip lanes (free right turn lanes) can be uncomfortable. In many cases, aggressive driving and inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities create conditions that frequently lead to drivers failing to yield, improper stopping (stopping too close to the crosswalk), parking too close to intersections (limiting driver visibility of people walking), and other issues. Even on residential streets with less traffic, fast and aggressive driving can discourage walking trips. These concerns are heightened for the seniors and children, some of the most vulnerable roadway users, and most likely to access more neighborhood-focused destinations.

A slip lane at the intersection of Madison Avenue & Garfield Avenue is shown here. Source is Google Maps.

Next is a pedestrian walking along a detached sidewalk with landscaping, lined with flowers and trees, on Marconi Avenue.

Included as well is a sidewalk approaching an I-80 interchange in North Highlands.

Throughout unincorporated Sacramento County, few residents can walk to a grocery store or their local school. There are large areas of unincorporated County without a large grocery store. Most unincorporated County residents cannot walk to a grocery within ten minutes; 20% of unincorporated residents and only 10% of EJ Community residents can complete this walk using low-stress roads. Improving connections to grocery stores within EJ Communities is consistent from EJ Element Policy EJ-13, providing safe, convenient opportunities to access healthy foods within these neighborhoods.

Fewer than half of unincorporated residents (40%) can access their closest school within a ten-minute, low-stress walk. Only 17% of EJ Community residents can access their local school within a ten-minute low-stress walk.

Further, poor walking conditions can hinder access to public transportation and limit potential bus stop amenities. Within a half-mile of all transit stops in unincorporated County, only 55% of the roads have complete sidewalks on both sides of the street. Almost 60% of unincorporated residents are within a low-stress ten-minute walk of a bus stop or light rail station. However, only 27% of EJ Community residents live within a ten-minute low-stress walk of a bus stop or light rail station. Improving walking infrastructure and crossing conditions will place more residents within a reasonable low-stress walking distance to stores, schools, public transit, and other essential neighborhood destinations.

BICYCLE FACILITIES:

The unincorporated County's bicycle network includes a mix of shared-use paths, bicycle lanes, and signed bicycle routes (Figure 12). There are about 304 miles of bicycle facilities, mostly bicycle lanes, across unincorporated Sacramento County (Figure 13). Although the bicycle network can be dense in many urban regions, given the vast geography of the unincorporated County, the network as a whole lacks connectivity.

Shown here is a bike lane on Marconi Avenue. The Marconi Avenue/Mission Avenue intersection includes actuated bicycle signal detection.

Following this is a bike lane on Fulton Avenue, near El Camino Avenue.

EXISTING BIKEWAY TYPES:

Class 1: Shared-use paths:

- These are dedicated paths for walking and bicycling completely separate from the roadway.
- One of the trail bridges over the American River is shown.
- In Figure 12, a graphic of a two-way bicycle lane is shown, with no lanes for vehicles in the vicinity.

Class 2: Bicycle lanes:

- These are striped lanes for people bicycling. Bicycle lanes can also include striped "buffer" areas between the bicycle and travel lane or between the bike lane and parked cars (sometimes both).

- A bike lane on Butano Drive near Country Club Centre is presented.
- A buffered bike lane on Hurley Way in West Arden is used as a second example.
- In Figure 12, a graphic of a bicycle lane that is directly adjacent to the street is shown.

Class 3: Bicycle Routes:

- These are signed routes for people bicycling. In more urbanized areas, these are typically lower-speed, lower-volume roadways. In more rural areas, especially in areas without paved shoulders, bike routes can be on higher-speed and higher-volume roadways.
- A bike route with a shared lane marking (sharrow), in the UC Irvine campus, is used as an example here.
- Figure 12 shows a graphic of a cyclist biking in the same lane as a vehicle.

Figure 13 shows a map of Existing Bikeways, with the following classes identified: Shared Use Paths (or Class 1), Bicycle Lanes (or Class 2), Buffered Bicycle Lanes (or Class 2B), Bicycle Routes (or Class 3), and Separated Bikeways (or Class 4).

ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION COMFORT:

Sidewalks and bike lanes alone are not enough to provide a comfortable and inviting walking or bicycling experience in Sacramento County. Sacramento County experiences extreme heat in the summertime, with average temperatures above 85

degrees Fahrenheit between May and September. Shade, often provided by tree canopy, can encourage physical activity in hotter temperatures while beautifying and supporting the natural environment. Within EJ Communities, North Highland and South Sacramento have a smaller portion of their roadways with shade cover than other unincorporated communities. West Arden-Arcade roughly has a proportional amount of tree canopy compared to non-EJ Communities. The lack of continuous walking and bicycling facilities and inconsistent shade cover can create uncomfortable and stressful conditions for those who walk and bike.

A stretch of Twin Cities Road in the southern Delta area of Sacramento County is shown here, lined with densely packed trees on both sides of the street.

Walking and Bicycling Safety:

Between January 1, 2015 and December 31, 2019, there were 2,038 injury or fatal collisions involving someone walking or biking reported in unincorporated Sacramento County. Of these collisions, 1,000 involved a vehicle colliding with someone walking, and 1,038 involved a collision between a vehicle and someone biking (SWITRS-Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System). A summary of the frequency and relative severity of these collisions is presented in Table 02. During the analysis period, there were roughly the same number of pedestrian- and bicycle-involved collisions. The average severity of a collision involving someone walking is more than twice as severe as a collision involving someone biking and more than three times as severe as compared to the average severity across all injury crashes.

Displayed here is a tree-lined sidewalk along Power Inn Road south of Calvine Road.

An analysis of collision location and frequency revealed the following trends:

- Far more collisions involving people walking or biking (approximately 3 times as many) occur at intersections as compared to mid-block locations. This is likely due to the increased number of potential conflict points where vehicles and people walking or biking can interact.
- While many more collisions occur at intersections, the severity of injuries incurred along segments is slightly higher, potentially due to increased vehicle speed.
- Based on collision severity, collisions involving people walking have twice the injury severity level as collisions involving people biking and more than three times the average severity level over all crashes.

Collision types, frequency, and severity in the EJ Communities areas were further analyzed to help focus future investment towards locations that would directly improve any safety deficiencies in these communities. This analysis found that overall, the North Vineyard area had a very low occurrence of collisions involving people walking or biking, due to low density and geography of the area. The other three EJ Communities had comparable collision frequency and severity for collisions involving people walking and biking. The EJ Element also provides a comparison of bike and pedestrian collision rates per 1,000 residents (Footnote 5), showing that non-EJ Communities have the lowest collision rate with North Vineyard having a collision rate only slightly higher. South Sacramento however has a rate almost twice as high as non-EJ areas. North Highlands and West Arden-Arcade both have a rate more than twice that of non-EJ areas.

Footnote 5: Sacramento County Environmental Justice Element (2019), Figure 11.

Table 02: Number of Collisions by Mode and Injury Severity:

Collision Type will be listed first, followed by the collision data.

Pedestrian Collisions:

Number of Collisions: 1000.

Fatal/ Severe Injury Collisions: 348.

Bicycle Collisions:

Number of Collisions: 1038.

Fatal/ Severe Injury Collisions: 139.

Vehicle Collisions:

Number of Collisions: 16190.

Fatal/ Severe Injury Collisions: 1150.

CONTRIBUTING COLLISION FACTORS:

Collision factors provide some clarification on what actions or conditions contributed to each collision. These can include built environment conditions (street type/condition, lighting, etc.), environmental conditions (time of day, weather, etc.), and human behavior. People driving not yielding to people in crosswalks and people crossing not yielding to drivers at non-crosswalk locations were the most frequent contributing factors for collisions involving someone walking in Sacramento County. People failing to yield to vehicles outside of a legal crosswalk was by far the most frequent cause of collisions involving people walking regardless of the collision location, occurring more often than the next four primary causes combined in all scenarios and location types

(vehicles violating pedestrian ROW, improper vehicle turning, unsafe speed, and unsafe starting or backing).

In terms collisions involving people biking, riding on the wrong side of the road (biking against the main direction of traffic) and improper turning (making an unsafe turning movement, or failure to signal) were the most frequent contributing factors to collisions. Riding on the wrong side of the road occurring more often than the next five primary causes combined at signalized intersections (traffic signal/sign violation, improper turning, person biking violating vehicle ROW, other hazardous violation, and unsafe speeds) and the next three primary causes combined along stop-controlled segments (improper turning, person biking violating vehicle ROW, and traffic signal/sign violation).

Pedestrian-involved collisions with high speed as a contributing factor resulted in the highest or second-highest injury severity across all locations. Bicycle- involved collisions with the high-speed factor caused the highest average collision injury severity at non-intersection locations.

HIGH INJURY NETWORK:

High-injury networks (HINs) were created to highlight corridors that have high concentrations of pedestrian- involved and bicycle-involved collisions, respectively. Each HIN is made of about 20 corridors. Corridors were selected for the HIN based on the both the frequency of pedestrian- or bicycle- involved collisions and the severity of the injuries. Figure 14 shows the pedestrian and bicycle HINs.

The complete safety analysis, including information on the bicycle and pedestrian HINs, can be found in Appendix A-2.

Figure 14: A map presenting the High Injury Network (or HINs) is shown, for both bicyclists and pedestrians.

Chapter 3: Public Engagement:

The chapter cover photo is a mosaic of faces, of people who attended public engagement meetings and workshops for the ATP. Three larger photos were included in the mosaic. One of which is a cloud of words wherein people filled in the blank in the statement “My dream street has…” (Answers include protected bike lanes, improved sidewalks, slowed driving speeds, more trees, diversity, and more). The second is a picture of a representative from an organization promoting alternative modes, at a pop-up event in a park. The third is of a man making use of micromobility, traveling on a scooter in a lane shared with vehicles, who appears to be about to make a left turn through a large intersection.

Next, a quote from Ken Chang, age 32, is presented:

“I currently walk in Fruitridge Manor. I feel like our community can prosper if we were given the resources to have more outdoor centered activities. …I would like to walk around areas with a lot of shade and water.”

Ken has been a South Sacramento resident for most of his life. A picture of him from his graduation day is included, where he is wearing his graduation cap and holding his diploma with pride.

Engagement Strategy:

Community engagement is an integral part of the planning process. The ATP included a thorough two-phased public engagement process, primarily done through virtual events due to the COVID-19 global pandemic. The County and its community partners made

every reasonable effort to reach a diverse group of Sacramento County residents and stakeholders while following appropriate health and safety guidelines. The ATP's Public Engagement Plan and detailed event summaries from all engagement phases can be found in Appendix B.

Phase 1:

The County led the first engagement phase from August 2020 through January 2021, with the goals of:

- Understanding perspectives and concerns around active transportation in Sacramento County.
- Collecting feedback on the Plan's goals and objectives.
- Building awareness and enthusiasm around the Plan.

Phase 2:

The County conducted the Phase 2 engagement between April and May 2021, with the intent to:

- Share and confirm the accuracy of the key themes and takeaways from the previous phase of public engagement.
- Gather feedback on the Plan's draft infrastructure recommendations.
- Learn more about community members' priorities for implementing active transportation projects.

ENGAGEMENT EVENTS:

During Phase 1, project staff met with 37 different organizations through 23 stakeholder meetings. These organizations represent different stakeholder interests, such as

Community-Based Environmental Justice Organizations, Health and Disability Organizations, Bike and Transportation Management Agencies, Youth and Older Adult Organizations, Government and Transit Agencies, and Advisory Committees (Figure 15). Nearly 200 community members and more than 40 stakeholder groups participated in virtual events during the Phase 1 engagement process. All events were virtual during Phase 1. Community members could also leave comments on an interactive webmap. Comments pointed out specific locations of concern. People also drew their current or preferred walking, biking, and rolling routes. About 300 comments, likes, and dislikes were provided on the webmap during Phase 1.

A virtual meeting with Sacramento Bike Hikers is shown.

The attendees from the American Association of Retired Persons pop-up virtual event are shown as well.

Stakeholder group table:

Figure 15: Participating Stakeholder Groups:

Community- Based and Environmental Justice Organizations:

- Asian Resources,
- Everyday Impact Consulting,
- GreenTech,
- Health Education Council,
- Impact Sacramento,
- International Rescue Committee,
- La Familia,
- Loaves and Fishes,

- Organize Sacramento,
- Sacramento Tree Foundation,
- WalkSacramento.

Health and Disability Organizations:

- ACB Capital Chapter of the California Council of the Blind,
- American Heart Association,
- Breathe California,
- Disability Rights California,
- Resources for Independent Living,
- Society for the Blind,
- UC Davis Trauma Prevention Center,
- United Cerebral Palsy.

Bike and Transportation Management Agencies:

- 50 Corridor Transportation Management Association,
- 80-Watt District,
- Bike Lab,
- North Natomas Jibe,
- Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates,
- Sacramento Bike Hikers,
- Sacramento Wheelmen.

Youth and Older Adult Organizations:

- American Association of Retired Persons,
- Asian Community Center Senior Services,
- Agency on Aging Area 4,
- Pro-Youth and Families,
- Sacramento Chinese Community Services Center,
- Sol Collective.

Local Government and Transit Agencies:

- E-Tran,
- Placer County Transit,
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments,
- Sacramento County Department of Human Assistance,
- Sacramento Regional Transit Mobility Advisory Council,
- SCT Link (Sacramento County),
- Sacramento County Disability Advisory Commission,
- Sacramento County Disability Compliance Office.

During Phase 2 engagement, the County engaged with over 50 residents at community workshops, over 80 residents across a series of in-person and virtual pop-up events (Figure 16), and received over 2,000 comments, likes, and dislikes on project recommendations.

Detailed community engagement summaries are located in Appendix B.

Moments are shown from an in-person pop-up event, at the Free Bicycle Tune-up at Don and Brenda Nottoli Community Park in Vineyard, May 21, 2021.

The following events took place during each Phase of Public Engagement:

Phase 1:

23 Virtual Stakeholder Meetings

Involving 37 organizations;

2 Virtual Community Workshops

With 90 participants;

10 Pop-Up Activities

With 110 participants;

830+ Online Survey Responses

In English, Spanish, and Russian;

280+ Comments or Likes on Online Web Map;

Phase 2:

2 Virtual Community Workshops

Including 50 participants;

10 Pop-Up Activities

With 84 participants;

2,600+ Comments or Likes on Interactive Web Map;

Figure 16. Pop-Up Locations:

The activity will be listed first, followed by the date or time period it was held on.

1: Scavenger Hunt Activity

(Summer/Fall 2020)

2: Sacramento Bike Hikers Member Meeting

(October 7, 2020)

3: Public Listening Session: Disability Focus,

CO-HOSTED BY RESOURCES FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING

(October 23, 2020)

4: Session with Fern Bacon Middle School students

(November 2, 2020)

5: Session with Foothill Ranch Middle School students

(November 4, 2020)

6: Public Listening Session: Older Adults Focus,

CO-HOSTED BY AARP

(December 3, 2020)

7: Public Listening Session:

West Arden-Arcade (English/Farsi)

CO-HOSTED BY INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

(December 23, 2020)

8: Public Listening Session:

South Sacramento (English/Spanish)

CO-HOSTED BY LA FAMILIA

(January 14, 2021)

9: Public Listening Session: Vineyard,

CO-HOSTED BY 50 CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

(January 19, 2021)

10: In-Person Survey Outreach (Russian)

(January 2021)

11: Public Listening Session: Delta,

CO-HOSTED BY THE SACRAMENTO COUNTY FARM BUREAU

(April 13, 2021)

12: Public Listening Session: West Arden-Arcade (English/Farsi)

CO-HOSTED BY INTERNATIONAL RESCUE COMMITTEE

(April 20, 2021)

13: Public Listening Session: Disability Focus,

CO-HOSTED BY RESOURCES FOR INDEPENDENT LIVING

(April 28, 2021)

14: Session with Foothill High School Leadership Class

(May 6, 2021)

15: Session with SACOG Youth Leadership Academy

(May 15, 2021)

16: Public Listening Session,

CO-HOSTED BY SACRAMENTO NATIVE AMERICAN HEALTH CENTER

(May 17, 2021)

17: Public Listening Session: Vineyard,

CO-HOSTED BY 50 CORRIDOR TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT AGENCY

(May 21, 2021)

18: Public Listening Session: South Sacramento (English/Spanish)

CO-HOSTED BY LA FAMILIA

(May 26, 2021)

19: Community Profiles: South Sacramento

(August 16, 2021)

20: Community Profile: Rio Linda/Elverta

(August 16, 2021)

All events except Events 10 (In-Person Survey Outreach (Russian)) and 17 (Public Listening Session: Vineyard) were held virtually.

A map is included showing where attendees live, go to school, or where community groups operate.

Key Public Engagement Themes:

Throughout the public engagement process, community members shared their active transportation concerns, needs, and desires. Several key themes emerged:

- Walking and Rolling Challenges: Sidewalk gaps, narrow shoulders, lack of shade trees, and uncomfortable crossings are significant challenges for those walking or rolling. Large intersections, railroad tracks, and other infrastructure components are barriers for many people.
- Biking Challenges: Lack of dedicated bicycle facilities, sharing the road with high-speed vehicles on multilane roads, and lack of shade cover make it stressful and uncomfortable to bike throughout the unincorporated County.
- Access to Transit: Transit stops and stations with few amenities (benches, shelters, etc.) create uncomfortable and undesirable places for people to wait for their transit vehicle. The lack of shade canopy (trees or

engineered structures) can also be problematic in the hotter spring and summer months. Poor sidewalk conditions and lack of ramps can make it challenging to access transit, especially for seniors and people with physical disabilities. Residents also wanted to ensure that the design of new walking and biking facilities (i.e., adding bike lanes or curb extensions) improves and does not hinder transit access and travel.

- Connectivity: Community members highlighted the need to build a more connected bicycle network that provides safe and comfortable routes to community-serving destinations like schools, parks, trails, and job centers. The need for better river crossings for active transportation users also emerged as a theme.
- Safety and Comfort: Walking and biking are uncomfortable for many residents across the County due to many of the challenges mentioned above. A lack of active transportation infrastructure, combined with fast-moving vehicles with little or no separation from walking and biking users, impacts comfort and actual and perceived safety.

Chapter 4: Infrastructure Recommendations:

A bus stop with a bench on Butano Drive is shown. A yellow pedestrian crossing sign is in view, with a large canopy of pink blooming flowers in the background.

The following is a quote from Kenneth Isenhower, Transportation Engineer, age 31, from Rio Linda/ Elverta:

“If facilities connecting the 75 community more widely to the only grocery store in the area were provided, I would take that path frequently and look at biking or rolling more often. Currently, the only north/south main road (Rio Linda Blvd) has high speeds and minimal pedestrian facilities.”

Shown is a picture of Kenneth walking his two dogs on a Class 1 path. They are passing under an archway with a sign saying, “Elverta”.

Project Recommendations:

Based on the needs, opportunities, and challenges identified through the existing conditions analysis, recommendations were developed through an iterative process with both County staff, partner agency stakeholders, and the community. This chapter describes recommended bicycle and pedestrian projects and provides additional information or toolkits for bicycle boulevards, wayfinding, and green infrastructure.

Recommendations described in this Plan serve as a foundation to create successful, well-used, and safe spaces for people to walk, bike, and roll. These planning-level project recommendations work together to build unincorporated Sacramento County’s active transportation network and encourage more people to walk, bike, and roll. In addition to projects identified in this Plan, the County can also install bicycle facilities and pedestrian enhancements on other roadways as appropriate.

Projects outside of Sacramento County’s unincorporated rights-of-way play an essential part in the overall completeness, connectivity, and reach of the transportation networks. When applicable, project recommendations have been made in these areas. However, implementing these projects requires additional coordination with other agencies and neighboring jurisdictions.

This Plan proposes pedestrian infrastructure improvements at 194 locations, 192 miles of sidewalks, and 1,218 miles of new or upgraded bicycle facilities (including study corridors).

While the Plan provides recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian projects, in some cases a more detailed master plan is needed. Such is the case for the American River Parkway, where this Active Transportation Plan only provides a few specific project recommendation on how to improve connectivity to the parkway. A more detailed master plan is needed to improve active transportation connections to the American River parkway trail system for the unincorporated communities of Arden-Arcade, Cordova, Carmichael, Fair Oaks, and Orangevale. The plan would identify gaps in connectivity, needed access improvements, access to existing and future transit, access to schools, access to housing, and employment, connections into the City of Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, and Folsom's trail network and access for environmental justice communities.

Pedestrian Recommendations:

Pedestrian recommendations were developed based on the following steps:

- Incorporate the unbuilt recommendations from the previous countywide planning efforts.
- Revise and add recommendations based on the data-driven needs analyses, future master-planned communities, feasibility, and public comment.
- Review projects to ensure they form a cohesive, connected network that serves the entire County.

PEDESTRIAN RECOMMENDATIONS:

This Plan recommends pedestrian infrastructure improvements at 194 locations across Sacramento County (Table 03) and 192 miles of sidewalk gap closures. Pedestrian spot improvement locations include infrastructure recommendations based on the type and size of streets and the type of intersection control. Each intersection size and control combination has a specific set of infrastructure recommendations designed to improve safety, comfort, and access within that context. These contextualized recommendations provide a toolkit of potential solutions that the County can use to improve these locations' walkability. Specific improvements for each location will be determined on a project-by-project basis using engineering and planning judgement.

Intersection sizes are described below:

- Small intersections: Two small residential streets (people walking typically have to cross two or three vehicle lanes).
- Medium intersections: One small street and one collector street or two collector streets (people walking typically have to cross two to four vehicle lanes).
- Major intersections: One collector street and an arterial or two arterial streets (people walking typically have to cross at least four vehicle lanes).
- Interstate ramp: Any street with a highway interchange.

Intersection traffic control falls under three categories:

- Signalized intersection.
- Stop sign-controlled intersection (all-way or two-way).
- Uncontrolled intersection.

A subset of 26 recommendations includes tailored recommendations specific to each location. These 26 locations are unsignalized locations within EJ Communities that are either along the pedestrian high-injury network or within a quarter-mile of a school. These important locations provide critical connections to schools, parks, and other neighborhood destinations within historically underserved communities.

Figure 17 show the location of each pedestrian improvement. Table 03 displays the number of recommendations in each category. These recommendations are defined in the Pedestrian Toolkit (pages 84-102). The full table of all 194 pedestrian improvement locations can be found in Table C-1 of Appendix C. The full list and maps of proposed sidewalk gap closures can also be found in Figure C-1 and Table C-2 within Appendix C. Pedestrian Districts were developed by the County's Planning and Community Development Department and are commercial corridors that have or could have high volumes of pedestrian traffic where improvements should be concentrated. The districts were carried over as part of the 2007 Pedestrian Master Plan are also included within pedestrian recommendation maps.

Table 03: Pedestrian Recommendation by Intersection Size and Control Type:

Small Intersections:

Signalized: 12,
Stop-controlled: 18,
Uncontrolled: 7,
Total: 37.

Medium Intersections:

Signalized: 65,
Stop-controlled: 8,
Uncontrolled: 7,
Total: 80.

Major Intersections:

Signalized: 44,
Stop-controlled: 2,
Uncontrolled: 2,
Total: 48.

Interstate Ramps:

Signalized: 3,
Stop-controlled: None,
Uncontrolled: None,
Total: 3.

Specific Project Locations:

Signalized: 2,
Stop-controlled: 21,
Uncontrolled: 3,
Total: 26.

There is a total of 126 Signalized, 49 Stop-controlled, and 19 Uncontrolled recommendations.

There are 194 recommendations total.

Pictured here is a mid-block crossing of River Road south of Locke Road in the Delta.

In Figure 17: a map of Recommended Pedestrian Improvements is shown. Various markers are used to label small intersections, medium

intersections, major intersections, highway interchanges, sidewalk gaps, and pedestrian districts.

PEDESTRIAN TOOLKIT: (Footnote 6)

This Plan's toolkit groups pedestrian infrastructure into six categories:

- Sidewalks, trails, and medians.
- Intersection and street design.
- Pavement markings.
- Pedestrian-actuated beacons.
- Street furniture.
- Studies.

Example infrastructure components from each of the categories are provided below.

Footnote 6: Items with an asterisk are included in the approved Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Tool Box. The Tool Box can be accessed at this website: https://sacdot.saccounty.net/ Pages/NTMP-ToolBox.aspx

SIDEWALKS, SHARED-USE PATHS, AND MEDIANS:

Sidewalks:

Sidewalks provide dedicated space for people walking and rolling. Sidewalks are raised from the roadway and sometimes have a planting strip for increased separation from the street. Obstructions like utility boxes, signs, and poles can limit available sidewalk width. The County should install and move existing street furniture and utilities on sidewalks to maintain a clear path of travel; it is critical for physical accessibility. Items obstructing

walking and rolling paths force people to use alternate routes or go around these objects on private property or in the street.

A Sidewalk on Florin Road, near Southgate Plaza, is shown.

Shared-Use Paths

Dedicated paths for walking and bicycling completely separate from the roadway. When paved with asphalt or concrete, trails can include markings to encourage the separation of modes.

Featured here are multiple groups of people jogging along the American River Parkway trail.

Curb Extensions*:

Curb extensions push the curb into the street and can provide several valuable traffic calming and safety benefits. Curb extensions shorten the crossing distance for people walking or rolling, provide improved visibility at intersections for drivers, and provide additional pedestrian queuing space. Curb extensions can be installed at intersections or mid-block. They can be made with permanent materials like cement or implemented as a "quick-build" project with pavement markings, detectable warning surfaces, paint, and bollards/delineators.

*An example shown is a curb extension with green infrastructure, in Carolan Avenue, Burlingame.

Curb Ramps:

Curb ramps allow for smooth, accessible transitions between the sidewalk and street level. Curb ramps are essential for those with special mobility needs, strollers, and many other users. Ramps must be built to current ADA standards and the California Building Code.

The example shown here is the corner of Diamond Ranch Drive and Gerber Road with pedestrian countdown signal head and curb ramp with tactile warning surface.

INTERSECTION AND STREET DESIGN:

Intersection Redesign:

Intersections are not always symmetrical. Intersections can have confusing or asymmetric designs when more than two streets come together or when two streets come together at non-90-degree angles. Design components like curb extensions, painted buffer areas, and medians can make these intersections more inviting, less stressful, and less confusing for active transportation users and people driving.

Exhibited is the intersection of Fair Oaks Boulevard and Manzanita Avenue.

Free Right Turn Lane/ Slip Lane Removal:

Free-right turn lanes facilitate increased vehicle throughput and faster turns at intersections at the expense of the safety and movement of people walking and biking. Rates of drivers yielding to people walking at slip lanes are much lower than at other

crossing locations. Intersections with slip lanes and bike lanes also create a bike mixing zone, as people biking need to move away from the curb and across the right turn lane to continue straight through the intersection. Many designs can be implemented during the slip lane removal process, including bulb outs and other curb work to adjust intersection geometry. Removing slip lanes can impact traffic flow through the intersection; some impacts may be mitigated through signal timing and other engineering adjustments.

A slip lane at Rockingham Drive is shown.

Traffic Calming*:

Traffic calming is the implementation of roadway changes to slow down vehicle traffic. SacDOT can consider various tools to slow vehicle traffic, including speed bumps, chicanes, speed feedback signs, and other items. Traffic calming is also an essential component of bicycle boulevards (see page 114 for more details on bicycle boulevard elements).

*A speed table on Madison Avenue is presented as an example.

Pedestrian Push Buttons and Signal Heads:

All new and redesigned intersections with pedestrian crossings need to be built to current ADA standards. These standards include using accessible pedestrian buttons and signal heads that audibly communicate information about location and pedestrian signal timing for those with mobility and visual impairments.

Pictured is an ADA compliant push button next to a curb ramp with tactile warning surface, across from Kaiser Medical Center off of Morse Avenue.

PAVEMENT MARKINGS AND CROSSWALKS:

Advance Yield and Advance Stop Markings*:

Advance yield pavement markings, also referred to as “shark's teeth,” are markings placed on the roadway 20 to 50 feet before a mid-block crosswalk or crosswalk at an intersection approach without a signal or stop sign.

Advance stop lines are solid white lines that extend across intersection approach lanes. They indicate the point behind which vehicles are required to stop in compliance with a STOP sign or other traffic control device that requires vehicles to stop, like a pedestrian-hybrid beacon.

*Advance stop markings on a neighborhood street in Burlingame are shown. Captured in the background are two kids biking through the neighborhood on a sunny day, with their guardian, also on a bike.

Crosswalks:

Transverse crosswalks consist of two thick lines that demarcate pedestrian right-of-way at intersections and mid-block locations. High-visibility crosswalks are marked with wide bars, drawing additional attention and awareness to the crossing. There are multiple high-visibility crosswalk designs (continental, ladder, etc.).

In school zones, these crosswalks are yellow.

Shown as an example is a high-visibility crosswalk across Northrop Avenue connecting to Swanston Park and Community Center.

Decorative Crosswalks:

Decorative crosswalks can add a placemaking element to the street while still serving a marked crosswalk's primary visibility and awareness objectives. Decorative crosswalks can be themed to reflect the surrounding neighborhood or nearby destinations. Decorative crosswalks must meet specific design parameters to remain compliant with state and federal standards; most importantly, they include transverse markings around any decorative pavement treatment.

Speed Tables, Raised Crosswalks, and Raised Intersections*:

Speed tables reduce vehicle speeds by elevating the entire wheelbase of a vehicle (unlike a speed bump that raises each axle individually). Speed tables can include a mid-block raised crosswalk; in these cases, the height of the speed table matches the sidewalk. This treatment makes people walking more visible to approaching motorists and also slows vehicles.

Raised intersections elevate the entire intersection to the sidewalk level, providing improved visibility of people walking and reducing vehicle speeds for all intersection approaches. Raised intersections are typically applied in high-pedestrian areas.

A raised crosswalk in front of the public library on C Street in Hayward is pictured.

Trail Markings:

Paved trails can include striping to demarcate separate areas for people walking and biking. Encouraging spatial separation can reduce conflicts, particularly on crowded trails with high pedestrian usage, and improve the efficiency and consistency of bicycle travel.

Shown here are people walking, jogging, and biking on the Harold Richey Memorial Bridge, which crosses over the American River.

PEDESTRIAN-ACTUATED BEACONS:

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB):

RRFBs are user-activated flashing lights used at unsignalized intersections or mid-block crossings. These beacons alert motorists to the presence of people in the crosswalk. These are most commonly used on two- to four-lane roadways. RRFBs are not universally accessible and can be difficult for people with visual impairments to use. RRFBs need an additional audible push button locator tone and a speech message to become accessible to people with vision impairment. The audible message should be a speech message that says, “Yellow lights are flashing”. The audible message should be spoken twice.

A RRFB on California Drive, Burlingame, is presented as an example.

Pedestrian-Hybrid Beacon (PHB):

A pedestrian hybrid beacon is a signal designed to increase the safety of people walking at unsignalized locations on multilane roadways. Thresholds for installation vary

based on the posted speed limit, crossing distance, vehicular volumes, and volumes of pedestrian crossings.

A PHB crossing on Grand Avenue, Oakland, with large clouds in the background is shown.

STREET FURNITURE AND UTILITIES:

Street Trees:

Street trees are an essential component of streetscape design. Trees provide shade, which in hotter climates like Sacramento County, can help encourage physical activity (walking, biking, and rolling) while beautifying and supporting the natural environment. Appropriate tree selection is vital to minimize tree maintenance costs, reduce the impact of roots disrupting sidewalks, and limiting the need for tree trimming to maintain clear sightlines and travel paths.

Pictured is a tree-lined segment of Bradshaw Road near Tribeca Drive.

Lighting:

Pedestrian-scale lighting improves visibility for both people walking and driving, particularly at intersections. Lighting can be achieved on one light pole (one light for the road and one light for the sidewalk) or separate poles. These lights focus on illuminating the sidewalk, not the roadway. Lighting is also an essential consideration along trails.

Shown here is Pedestrian-scale lighting, along with two people walking down a sidewalk beside some shops, in downtown Burlingame.

Street Furniture/Amenities:

Street furniture includes benches, transit shelters, trash cans, newsstands, and other items within the public right-of-way. These items can help to make the walking or rolling experience more comfortable and visually appealing. Transit shelters provide a location out the elements for people to wait, benches provide people walking a place to sit and rest, trash cans can help reduce litter by providing a place for people to throw their trash away, etc.

A shaded SacRT bus stop with bench on Butano Drive is shown.

STUDIES:

Stop Signs and Traffic Signals:

Stop signs and traffic signals are traffic control devices used to regulate traffic through an intersection. Implementing stop signs and traffic signals is regulated by the CA-MUTCD and requires a technical analysis before implementation.

Included here is traffic signal at Marconi Avenue & Mission Avenue.

Complex Intersections and Crossings:

While most of the locations examined for the Plan have recommendations, some sites will require additional study and traffic analysis to determine an appropriate alternative that improves safety for all users. Other sites will require coordination with other agencies.

The intersection of Florin Road and Stockton Boulevard is shown. Source: Google Maps.

Bicycle Recommendations:

The County developed bicycle recommendations through an iterative process with both County staff and County residents:

- Step 1: Incorporated the unbuilt recommendations from the previous Countywide bicycle plan and other planning efforts.
- Step 2: Revised and added recommendations based on the data-driven needs analysis, future master-planned communities, feasibility, and other factors.
- Step 3: Reviewed projects to ensure they form a cohesive, connected network that serves the entire County.

A person biking on Garfield Avenue is shown.

BICYCLE RECOMMENDATIONS:

This Plan recommends 108 miles of upgraded bicycle facilities and 1,110 miles of new dedicated bicycle corridors for a total of 1,522 miles of recommendations across unincorporated Sacramento County (Table 04). Bicycle recommendations can be seen in Figure 18. The full list of bicycle projects can be found in Table C-6 and a mapbook of recommendations in Figure C-2.

Table 04: Existing and Recommended Bicycle Facilities by Class:

The following is data collected for each type of Bicycle Facility:

Shared-Use Path:

Existing: 63.8 miles,

Proposed: 349.1 miles,

Total: 412.9 miles.

Bicycle Lane:

Existing: 224 miles,

Proposed: 632.9 miles,

Total: 856.9 miles.

Buffered Bicycle Lane:

Existing: 2 miles,

Proposed: 36.1 miles,

Total: 38.1 miles.

Bike Route:

Existing: 14 miles,

Proposed: 0 miles,

Total: 14 miles.

Bicycle Boulevard:

Existing: 0 miles,

Proposed: 54.2 miles,

Total: 54.2 miles.

Study Corridors:

Existing: 0 miles,

Proposed: 145.6 miles,

Total: 145.6 miles.

Overall Total:

Existing: 303.8 miles,

Proposed: 1217.92 miles,

Total: 1521.7 miles.

Included next is Figure 18: a map of Recommended Bicycle Facilities. Both existing and proposed bikeways are labelled, categorized by class: Shared Use Paths (or Class 1), Bicycle Lanes (or Class 2), Buffered Bicycle Lanes (or Class 2B), Bicycle Routes (or Class 3), Bicycle Boulevards (or Class 3B), Separated Bikeway (or Class 4), and Study Corridors.

BICYCLE TOOLKIT:

This toolkit provides descriptions and images of each type of recommended bicycle facility. The following section provides details on the infrastructure tools that can create bicycle boulevards.

Bicycle Facilities:

Class 1 Shared-Use Path: (trails)

Dedicated paths for walking and bicycling completely separate from the roadway.

A Class 1 path is shown, shaded by a large tree, with no vehicle or road in the vicinity.

Class 2 Bicycle Lane:

Striped lanes for people bicycling.

A cyclist is shown using a striped lane on a neighborhood street.

Class 2B Buffered Bicycle Lane:

Bicycle lanes that include a striped “buffer” area either between the bicycle lane and the travel lane or between the bicycle lane and parked cars (sometimes in both locations).

Shown here is a biker riding down a relatively busy street, though now with a striped buffer area between the road and the bike lane.

Class 3B Bicycle Boulevard:

Routes on low-speed, low-volume streets where roadway space is shared with people driving, enhanced with traffic calming features or other treatments to prioritize the comfort of people biking. A toolkit of bicycle boulevard strategies can be found on page 114. Treatments will be specific to each corridor and determined based on local community input and planning and engineering judgment.

Pictured here are roads with sharrows, or “bicycle boulevard” markings, running through evidently low-traffic areas—that is, a compound, or a quieter part of a neighborhood. One is from Berkeley, California, while the other was taken on Doyle Street, Emeryville.

Class 4 Separated Bikeway:

On-street bicycle facilities with a physical barrier between the bicycle lane and motor vehicle lane(s). Barriers can include bollards, curbs, elevation, or parking. These facilities may be bidirectional or unidirectional.

Four examples are used here. The first is from Rosemead Boulevard, Temple City, showing a biker using a bikeway that has plant boxes and trees used as buffers from the road. The second is a cyclist riding down a bikeway protected by striping and bollards, on Walnut Avenue, Fremont. Third, another bikeway protected by striping and bollards is shown, this time on Main Street, Los Angeles. Lastly, a green-painted bikeway on Polk Street, San Francisco is shown, separated from the street by an island with plants and concrete curb.

Class 4 Study Corridors:

The ATP includes over 145 miles of recommended study corridors for Class 4 separated bikeways. These corridors are important pieces of the County’s overall bicycle network and must include facilities that can provide comfortable, low-stress connectivity through and across multiple neighborhoods. Due to constraints within the built environment (such as limited available roadway width), these corridors require

additional study and community engagement opportunities before formal recommendations can be made.

Additional studies will typically identify the roadway changes that would be necessary in order to install a bicycle facility. These changes may include removal of street parking or removal of vehicle travel lanes. In some cases, a road diet (reduction of travel lanes while maintaining a turning lane) may be appropriate. The study process would include a dedicated community engagement process with local stakeholders and community members. The design of these facilities will include the needs of paratransit riders, people with disabilities, and other users with special needs to ensure accessibility and will also consider proposed pedestrian improvements to minimize design conflicts and ensure project feasibility. The study may result in a recommended Class 4 separated bikeway design; however, it may also recommend a different bike facility.

BICYCLE BOULEVARD TOOLKIT: (Footnote 7)

Unlike other bicycle facilities, bicycle boulevards are unique in that solutions for each corridor can vary based on specific community needs and desires. The toolkit of available treatments allow each street's specific design to fit its needs. Bicycle Boulevards can create an environment where bicycle travel is prioritized in a shared space with cars. Bicycle boulevards have an important role within the proposed bicycle network. These recommendations provide connections within communities to the larger bicycle network and form critical connections to neighborhood destinations like schools, parks, and libraries. The traffic calming effects of bicycle boulevards not only make it more comfortable to bike, but also create more enjoyable environments for people walking. The safety benefits of slower corridors benefit all road users, people biking, walking, and driving. Bike boulevards have also been recommended to help close gaps in the bicycle network where bike lanes or other dedicated bike facilities are more complex to implement, strengthening the overall network and improving connectivity across the County.

The County will analyze individual corridors to determine which treatments reflect the solutions that will bring about the highest increase in comfort and safety for people bicycling. Selected treatments will also incorporate the needs and desires of nearby residents and stakeholders. Treatments will vary from simple signage and striping only to more advanced intersection redesigns. This Plan does not provide specific treatment recommendations for individual bicycle boulevard corridors.

There are three primary categories of improvements:

- Signs and pavement markings.
- Vehicle speed management.
- Vehicle volume reduction.

Footnote 7: Items with an asterisk are included in the approved Neighborhood Traffic Management Program Tool Box.

Pavement Markings and Signage:

Pavement Markings*:

Bicycle boulevards can have unique pavement markings or sharrows to reinforce that the street is a shared space for people biking and driving. Sharrows may also have green backing to increase driver awareness. Pavement markings can also include edge line or centerline lane striping to delineate roadway space clearly.

Pictured here are the pavement markings on a Bicycle boulevard in Berkeley.

Wayfinding Signs:

Wayfinding is an essential component of the overall bicycle network but plays an even more significant role on bicycle boulevards. Bicycle boulevards may weave through neighborhoods, increasing the importance of signage to help users easily navigate their trips. Wayfinding can also help raise awareness of the presence of the bicycle boulevard. Signage should help people to understand how to get to their destination regardless of their ability.

Shown is a wayfinding sign in the American River Parkway.

Vehicle Speed Management:

Reduced Speed Limits:

In some areas, especially around schools, reducing the speed limit below 25 mph may be a helpful strategy in slowing cars and making people biking and walking more comfortable in the corridor.

Neighborhood Traffic Circles*:

Neighborhood traffic circles are an alternative intersection treatment to a signal or stop sign. Traffic circles can regulate the flow of traffic while adding a traffic calming element.

A neighborhood traffic circle in Burlingame is shown.

Bulb Outs*:

Bulb outs, also called curb extensions, extend the curb into the street. Curb extensions slow vehicle turning movements by tightening curb radii and forcing cars to make sharper turns. In mid-block settings (with mid-block crosswalks), they also physically

and visibly narrow the roadway, encouraging slower speeds. Bulb outs shorten crossing distances for people walking, provide improved visibility of people walking and biking at intersections, and provide additional pedestrian queuing space.

A curb extension on Palmetto Avenue, Pacifica, is presented.

Chicanes:

Chicanes add gentle curves to otherwise straight streets. Adding curves to the road slows car traffic by narrowing the travel lane and requiring cars to follow the curve. The lane adjustments can be created with striping or with offset curb extensions/ landscaping.

Two bikers are shown on a bicycle boulevard with chicanes in Berkeley.

Pinch Points:

Pinch points, also known as chokers, narrow available roadway width with two curb extensions. Limiting the available width forces people driving to slow down to navigate the pinch point.

Pictured is a pinch point consisting of an island and concrete curb narrowing the street, with a rectangular black and yellow striped sign that would be visible as one drives into the pinch point.

Speed Humps/Speed Lumps*:

Speed humps (and similar devices) span the roadway's width and encourage cars to slow down. Speed humps have a design speed of 15-20 mph. Speed lumps are similar

to speed humps but are designed with slots for emergency vehicles, buses, and other large vehicles. The vertical deflection from speed humps and speed lumps can be uncomfortable for people biking; speed lumps may be a preferred option on bicycle boulevards as people biking can also use the wheel cut.

Speed humps on Valley Wood Drive are pictured as examples.

Median Islands/Center Island Narrowing*:

Median islands and center island narrowing are variations of roadway medians that provide similar traffic calming benefits but can have different aesthetic and crossing pedestrian crossing effects dependent on their design. Median islands create a pinch point for traffic in the center of the roadway slowing through and turning vehicles and providing shorter crossing distances for people walking when used in tandem with a marked crossing. Medians can also divert through traffic onto other corridors where drivers can move faster. Center island narrowing medians are typically placed at neighborhood entrances and act as gateways into the neighborhood. This provides similar benefits to standard medians and include more placemaking elements like textured pavement and landscaping.

A Median Island on a residential street is shown.

VEHICLE VOLUME REDUCTION:

Right-in/Right-out Diverters:

Right-in/right-out diverters can be installed to allow people biking to proceed straight through the intersection while directing motorists to turn right. The island can accommodate bicycle access to the corridor while reducing conflicts and allowing local

and emergency vehicles. Left turns from the major street onto the bikeway are typically prohibited, while right turns are still allowed.

Pictured here are people biking on a bicycle boulevard, with a sign at the beginning of the boulevard that reads, ”Do not enter except bicycles”.

Full Diverters:

Full diverters block all motor vehicles from continuing on a neighborhood bikeway, while people biking can continue unrestricted. Full closures can be constructed to be permeable to emergency vehicles.

A cyclist is shown riding through a full diverter on a bicycle boulevard, with emergency vehicle access, in Palo Alto. Red and gold decorations are strung on the trees throughout this neighborhood.

BICYCLE SUPPORT FACILITIES:

Bicycle Parking:

Bicycle parking is typically divided into short-term and long-term parking. Short-term parking is meant to accommodate people biking who park for up to two hours, e.g., shoppers, post office customers, and library patrons. Long-term parking, such as bike lockers, is for riders who park over two hours, e.g., people taking transit, employees, students, and residents. New developments within Sacramento County are required to provide bicycle parking based on the Zoning Code (Section 5.9.9). For already developed areas, the County should coordinate with local businesses, property owners, and open space agencies to install secure bicycle parking near major destinations

across the County. The installation of bike racks is subject to environmental, security, right-of-way, maintenance, and property owner factors.

Demand for bicycle parking across already developed areas was analyzed for recommendations by examining land use (zoning), destinations (parks, libraries, etc.), and results from the origin-destination analysis in a weighted model to approximate demand for bicycle parking. Bike parking demand locations are shown in Figure 19.

Included here is Figure 19: a map on Bike Parking Demand. Areas of High Demand are identified.

Bicycle Racks:

Bike racks provide short-term parking and should accommodate visitors, customers, and others expected to depart within two hours. Racks should follow an approved standard, with appropriate placement and weather protections. Racks should also accommodate a variety of bicycle types.

Shown is a group of U-rack bicycle racks in Rancho Cordova.

Next are decorative "peace sign" bike racks located off of Winding Way.

Bicycle Corrals:

On-street bike corrals (also known as on-street bicycle parking) consist of bicycle racks grouped in a common area on the street, typically in a former car parking space. Bicycle corrals are reserved exclusively for bicycles and provide a relatively inexpensive solution for high-capacity bicycle parking. Each motor vehicle parking space could be replaced with approximately 6-10 bicycle parking spaces.

Shown is a bike parked in an in-street bicycle corral, in Los Angeles.

Bicycle Lockers:

Bike lockers offer a secure, long-term parking area for bicycles. They typically provide a semi-enclosed space that provides a higher level of security than standard bike racks. They are usually accessible via key-card, combination lock, or key. Increased security protections enable biking to be a practical transportation option for those whose most significant concern is theft and vulnerability.

Locations of current bike lockers at SacRT light rail stations are shown below:

- Marconi/Arcade,
- Mather Field/ Mills,
- 13th Street,
- Sunrise,
- 23rd Street,
- Hazel,
- 59th Street,
- Iron Point,
- Power Inn Glenn, (Footnote 8)
- College Greens,
- Historic Folsom, (Footnote 9)
- Watt/Manlove,
- Florin,
- Starfire,
- Meadowview,
- Tiber,

- Franklin,
- Butterfield,
- Center Parkway,
- Cosumnes River College.

Bicycle lockers are also available at other locations across Sacramento County.

Footnote 8: For more information on Sacramento Regional Transit's bike locker program or to request a lease agreement, please call (9 1 6) 3 2 1- B U S S (or 2 8 7 7) or fill out a contact form at https://www.sacrt.com/contact-us/.

Footnote 9: For information on how to lease a bike locker at Iron Point, Glenn or Historic Folsom, call the City of Folsom at 916-355-7285. In addition, many light rail stations have ribbon-style bike racks available for no charge.

Pictured are bike lockers at a transit station. It is set outdoors in the parking lot, allowing one to leave their bike behind a secured locked metal casing and easily head to their next destination or next form of transportation.

End-of-Trip Facilities:

Besides providing secure bicycle parking for people biking, jurisdictions, businesses, and employers should also offer end-of-trip facilities. End-of-trip facilities include changing rooms, clothes lockers, restrooms, and showers. These promote and facilitate active trips (especially commute trips) by making bicycling (and walking) commutes

more practical. Multiple studies have found that robust end-of-trip facilities can encourage additional walking and biking commuting trips by removing obstacles for active transportation users, such as a desire not to show up to work sweaty or knowing they have a secure place to store their belongings. In addition to making walking and biking more attractive, these studies also touted many workplace performance benefits from employees who used active transportation to get to work, such as arriving to work with better focus, having higher productivity, and increased happiness. (Footnote 10)

Footnote 10: End-of-trip facilities for bicycle riders." Queensland Transport. Queensland Government. (2006). https://bikeleague.org/sites/default/files/BFB_Queensland_End_of_trip_facilities_for_bicycle_riders.pdf

Bicycle Detection at Signalized Intersections:

Bicycle detection notifies the traffic signal controller that a person bicycling is waiting to cross the intersection. Bicycle detection provides similar functionality to pedestrian crossing buttons or vehicle loop detectors. There are various methods of detecting bicycles at intersections, but the most common methods are bicycle loop detectors and cameras. Bicycle detection at signals can provide many benefits to people biking including a reduction in travel delay, improving the safety and convenience of bicycling, discouraging red-light running by people bicycling, and prolonging the green phase to allow people bicycling to clear an intersection. (Footnote 11)

Footnote 11: NACTO - Urban Bikeway Design Guide.

Bicycle detector pavement markings at the opening of an intersection are shown.

Additional Infrastructure Toolkits and Information:

WAYFINDING:

Navigational Elements:

The fundamental family of signs that provide people walking and biking with navigational information consists of decision, confirmation, and turn signs, described in Figure 20 and Table 05. Figure 21 provides typical locations of signs. Decision signs (D) are located before an intersection of two routes. Turn signs (T) are found before turns. Confirmation signs (C) are located after the turning movement and periodically along routes for reassurance. Guidance on bicycle wayfinding signage can be found in the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

Signage Technical Guidance:

A variety of standards and guidelines influence both the designs and placement of wayfinding elements in Sacramento County. The Manual of Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) provides standards and guidelines for the design, size, and content of wayfinding signs. However, many jurisdictions have implemented unique signs to enhance visibility while reinforcing local identity.

Bicycle Guide Signs:

Both on-street and off-street bicycle facilities are required to follow the standards within the MUTCD. The State of California has adopted specific state standards for all traffic control devices called the CA MUTCD, which supersedes the MUTCD:

- D11-1: Bicycle Route Guide Sign.
- D1-1b: Destination Supplemental Sign.
- M7-1 through M7-7 Directional Arrow Supplemental Sign.

Sacramento County Department of Regional Parks has an adopted American River Parkway Signage Manual which should also be referenced when considering trail or trailhead signage in other areas of the County. The combination of standard signs with modifications allows for consistent signage throughout Sacramento County while branding the network.

Community Wayfinding:

Community wayfinding signs allow for an expression of community identity, reflect local values and character, and provide more information. California has not yet adopted MUTCD community wayfinding standards, but many communities use these.

Other Wayfinding Elements:

In addition to the core elements, several other wayfinding elements should be considered:

- Distance and time:

  Adding distance in familiar units can be a helpful encouragement tool for bicycling and walking. Some jurisdictions include travel time.

- Street name sign blades and sign toppers:

  Some jurisdictions have enhanced street name sign blades to recognize bikeways and major pedestrian routes.

- Pavement markings:

Directional pavement markings indicate confirmation of bicycle or pedestrian presence on a designated route and indicate turn locations. Pavement markings can often be more visible and can help supplement or reinforce signage.

A mile marker sign for bicyclists is shown that says, “Folsom Blvd, 0.1 miles” with an arrow pointing north, and “Light Rail, 0.4 miles” with an arrow pointing East.

A Davis Bike Loop logo painted on pavement is also shown.

Table 05: Wayfinding Sign Information:

Decision Sign:

- Clarify route options when more than one is available.
- Typically include a system brand.
- Up to 3 destinations.
- Distance in time or miles. (based on 10 mph or 6 minutes per mile)
- FHWA standard size for three destinations is 18 inches in Height by 30 inches in Width.
- Municipalities can modify, often 24 inches in Width by 30 inches or 36 inches in Height, and place a bicycle symbol at the top.
- Generally, 6 inches of vertical space per destination.
- Sign width not standardized by the CA MUTCD.

Confirmation Sign:

- Placed after turn movement or intersection to reassure that they are on the correct route.
- Standard D11-1 series signs, system brand mark, and route or pathway name may be included.
- The minimum size of 24 inches in width by 18 inches in height should be used for bike route signs, both on and off-street.

Turn Sign:

- Clarify a specific route at changes in direction.
- Used when only one route option is available.
- Standard D1-1 series sign: system brand mark, route or pathway name, and/or a directional arrow may be included.
- A minimum of 6 inches should be used for arrow plaque; the width may vary with destination length.
- Standard turn arrows (M5 and M6 series) may be used to clarify movements.

Wayfinding Sign Note: Vertical clearance beneath signs shall conform to the CA MUTCD.

Wayfinding:

Figure 20. Wayfinding Sign Types:

Here, a graphic of a bicyclist is shown lined in a row with three wayfinding signs. In the background are height markers increasing in 1

foot increments, going up to 10 feet. The bicyclist is 6 feet tall when riding, while all three signs are 8 feet tall.

The first sign type is a Bicycle and Pedestrian Decision Sign. This is a sign with a short list of destinations and arrows pointing to which direction they are located.

The second sign type is a Bicycle and Pedestrian Confirmation Sign. This is a sign that states which single destination the current route is heading to. (For example, “TO Downtown”)

The last sign is a Bicycle and Pedestrian Turn Sign. This sign only has one arrow, and lets cyclists know which way to turn to reach a specific destination.

Figure 21. Wayfinding Sign Placement:

A simple layout of a sample map is used to show how Wayfinding signs would be placed along routes.

Green Infrastructure:

Active transportation improvements often provide additional opportunities to allow streets to function as more than just public space and mobility corridors—roads can become a vital, functional component of the natural ecosystem. Green infrastructure is a catchall term that describes sustainable stormwater management practices and infrastructure. As urban landscapes have paved and built over green space, they have disrupted hydrological cycles and have required stormwater infrastructure to manage

stormwater runoff and protect water quality. Green stormwater infrastructure can reintroduce ecological functions back into the environment. Through strategies including biofiltration planters, bioretention swales, trees, and permeable pavement surfaces, more water can return to the ground and natural systems while reducing strain on existing water systems.

These stormwater strategies can be implemented in various transportation facilities, including sidewalks and trails, planted buffers, curb extensions, medians, and landscaping projects.

An example of a planted sidewalk buffer that could be designed with green infrastructure components is shown. In the buffer is tall grass and a lavender plant.

School Zone Speed Limits:

Through Assembly Bill 321, local governments can extend school zones up to 1,000 feet and reduce speed limits within 500 feet of a school site to 15 mph in residential neighborhoods or on highways with speed limits of 30 mph or less when children are present.

At 15 mph, more than 90 percent of people walking are likely to survive a crash with only minor injuries. As speeds increase, however, crash severity increases dramatically. At 30 mph, most collisions result in severe pedestrian injuries, and nearly half may be fatal. At 40 mph, 90 percent of people walking will die in a crash. Reducing speeds even slightly can have a profound effect on safety for people walking and bicycling to school.

This Plan recommends the County consider this change around eligible schools. AB 321 requires engineering and traffic surveys to indicate that the existing speed limit is not appropriate.

Pictured is a family walking to Pacific Elementary. A scooter is seen packed in the back of a child's stroller, pushed by their mom. Other kids tag along on foot with their school backpacks.

Chapter 5: Program Recommendations:

On the chapter cover photo, a group of people pose with their bicycles and helmets on. They stand under a large canopy of brown and green leaves, with fallen leaves scattered all around.

Source is Jibe from North Natomas.

This chapter describes recommended bicycle- and pedestrian-related programs for Sacramento County. Programs are organized by the following categories: education, encouragement, support, safe routes to school, evaluation, and infrastructure. All program implementation is dependent on funding.

Educational Programs:

ADULT BICYCLE EDUCATION:

These courses are typically based on a League of American Bicyclists curriculum that focuses on how people bicycling should behave to be safer, more predictable, and more confident riding on streets both with and without dedicated bicycle facilities. Class topics may also include bicycle maintenance, riding at night/in bad weather, and other

essential topics. These programs are usually maintained through a partnership between the jurisdiction and local advocacy groups.

TRAFFIC TICKET DIVERSION PROGRAM:

Bicycle traffic ticket diversion programs are coordinated efforts between local law enforcement, traffic court, and bicycle advocacy organizations (that have education programs). People bicycling who have been issued a traffic ticket will have the option to attend a bicycle traffic safety class in lieu of paying the ticket fine. The safety classes would also be available to the general public. Santa Cruz County has implemented this as their “Bike Traffic School Program.”

An instructor is shown leading a bicycle education class. Source is Jibe from North Natomas.

DRIVER EDUCATION PROGRAMS/CAMPAIGNS:

Educational campaigns focusing on driver education is another tool that can work towards changing behavior and increasing awareness. The California Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) regularly has grant opportunities to fund educational campaigns that support pedestrian, bicycle, and roadway safety. These programs support OTS's goals of reducing injuries and fatalities of people walking and bicycling. Programs attempt to raise awareness about traffic rules, rights, and responsibilities for people driving, walking, or biking. Example campaigns that other jurisdictions have ran in the past include: “Pedestrians Don’t Have Armor” – CA OTS, “My Mom/Dad Works Here” – universal, and continuously updating a sign that shows driver yielding compliance at the intersection – St. Paul.

DRIVER AWARENESS:

Driver awareness programs work hand-in-hand with driver education programs. Awareness programs help people driving become more familiar with local infrastructure and gain a better understanding of roadway signs, roadway striping patterns, and expected bicycle behavior. Awareness programs are especially important as new or unfamiliar infrastructure elements are introduced to communities. The programs can help communities become more comfortable with the facilities and understand their intended use.

Pictured is a child with a pink helmet, shirt, and bicycle, being taught how to ride by their guardian, at Prospect Hill Park in Gold River.

Encouragement Programs:

SOCIAL WALKING AND BIKING:

People who are uncomfortable bicycling or walking alone or unfamiliar with the best routes to use will benefit from having a group to show them the way. Outings can also be informal education opportunities to remind participants about safe walking and bicycling behavior. Activities should target different modes and user groups (kids, seniors, people with mobility impairments, etc.). Youth centers, senior centers, and community centers also can be partners in organizing and hosting these activities.

BICYCLE FRIENDLY BUSINESS PROGRAM:

Bicycle Friendly Business programs recognize businesses that make it easy and convenient for employees and customers to arrive by bicycle. These programs ask businesses to implement different strategies to accommodate the needs of customers and employees. Some of these strategies include providing bicycle parking (or being

close to publicly available parking), providing discounts to people biking, supporting and encouraging employees to bike to work, or participating and sponsoring special biking-focused events. The County could help promote these businesses, improve/provide nearby infrastructure, and create a consistent “Sacramento County Bicycle Friendly Business” logo or identity.

BICYCLE FRIENDLY UNIVERSITY PROGRAM:

The League of American Bicyclists’ Bicycle Friendly University program recognizes institutions of higher education for promoting and providing a more bikeable campus for students, staff, and visitors. College and university campuses are unique environments that are typically great environments for bicycling. In addition to building bicycle-friendly infrastructure on campus, institutions can incorporate bike share programs, bike co-ops, bike clubs, educational classes, and implement policies and programs that promote bicycling as a preferred means of transportation. The County can partner with local institutions, such as American River College and Cosumnes River College, to help them reach Bicycle Friendly University-related goals.

BICYCLE FRIENDLY COMMUNITY PROGRAM:

The Bicycle Friendly Community (BFC) program acts as a blueprint to guide communities striving to improve bicycling conditions. Within the program, there are ten building blocks that make up the BFC report card. These metrics include statistics on bicycle facilities, bicycle education in schools, jurisdictional spending on bicycling, jurisdictional laws and policies, bike plan status, and others. Based on the results of the report card, jurisdictions are assigned a status: bronze, silver, gold, platinum, and diamond. Formally tracking these metrics, and re-applying to the program at regular intervals, helps communities track their progress improving bicycling facilities, programs, and policies over time. Communities can use this tool to work with SacDOT

and other County staff to move towards implementing the ATP and other community goals with quantifiable metrics.

ADOPT-A-TRAIL PROGRAM AND TRAIL CLEAN UP PROGRAMS:

The Adopt-A-Trail Program would partner with local groups and associations to clean and maintain trail facilities within Sacramento County. When groups adopt a trail, they agree to organize cleanup efforts to help maintain the trail periodically. A sign or other indication acknowledging the support of the outside organization can be installed along the trail. The County could also provide trash bags and gloves and set up a loaner tools/ equipment system to make it easier for more groups to participate.

Trail users can also help keep Sacramento County trails clean by reporting trash and obstacles to the County using 3 1 1. The County can also work with local groups to help organize regularly scheduled clean-up days on trails across the County.

Support Programs:

EARN A BIKE/BIKE BUILD PROGRAM:

The County could partner with local community-based organizations and advocacy groups to create a program where community members learn and practice bicycle maintenance skills and, over time, earn a bicycle they built or repaired.

BIKE MATCH PROGRAM:

A Bike Match program could match donated bikes in good condition to essential workers or others who need a bicycle for transportation. This program could coordinate pick-up/ drop-off directly between the donator and recipient, both of whom sign a liability

waiver relieving the sponsoring organization of any responsibility for the bicycle's quality or condition.

COMMERCIAL CARGO BIKE SUPPORT PROGRAM AND INFRASTRUCTURE:

Cargo bikes have shown great promise as an alternative to some truck and van commercial and residential deliveries. Due to limited available curb loading space, delivery vehicles frequently stop in bike lanes and vehicle lanes to load/unload their goods. Cargo bikes can reduce these conflicts and deliver packages more efficiently; on average, they deliver goods faster and with significantly fewer emissions than traditional methods. (Footnote 12)

To develop a Cargo Bicycle Program, SacDOT would partner with interested logistics/delivery companies to:

- Determine the number of bikes that can be used and the specifications of those bikes. (consistent with the CA Vehicle Code)
- Develop policies for where cargo bikes can/cannot unload and create cargo-bike specific hubs (for parking, loading, breaks, etc.) in areas with high demand or loading area constraints.
- Decide on appropriate education/ training for all cargo bike delivery staff.
- Establish enforcement policies and guidelines. (working with local law enforcement or DOT staff)
- Create a data-sharing agreement.

SacDOT should coordinate improvements to the bicycle network with the creation/future expansions of the cargo bike program to maximize its effectiveness and improve the safety of the workers. Jurisdictions within the United States that are currently piloting cargo bike programs include New York City, Fort Lauderdale, Pittsburgh, Seattle, and Portland.

Footnote 12: The source address is https://static1.squarespace.com/static/5d30896202a18c0001b49180/t/61091edc3acfda2f4af7d97f/1627987694676/The+Promise+of+Low-Carbon+Freight.pdf.

BIKEWAY MAPS AND SAFETY INFORMATION:

As Sacramento County's bicycle network continues to grow, it will be essential to maintain an up-to-date map of current facilities. This map should be made available online and also in print form (refreshed periodically). Maps can be distributed at bike shops, libraries, and other destinations. Both print and online resources are opportunities to share safety tips and additional topical information.

BICYCLE REPAIR:

Partner with local advocacy groups to offer bicycle repair classes and other resources for the public. Partner with local advocacy groups or bike shops to host pop-up bike repair clinics in locations where there are no bicycle shops nearby. These pop-up events should be targeted in EJ Communities and other disadvantaged areas to help reach the most vulnerable populations.

Two people are shown repairing a bike together at a pop-up workshop.

Safe Routes to Schools Programs: (working with local partners and school districts)

EDUCATION:

Bike Education:

Bicycle education ranges from learning to ride to learning the rules of the road and on-bike drills practice during a ‘bike rodeo.’ These are typically held during PE classes or after school, depending on the arrangement with the school. Typically, bicycle education classes or rodeos are organized by grade level, with an age-appropriate program for elementary, middle, and high school students.

Pedestrian Education:

Pedestrian education teaches people their rights and responsibilities as pedestrians. Pedestrian rodeos teach students, typically 1st and 2nd grade, how to walk safely, including crossing intersections, walking where there is no sidewalk, and being aware of driveways.

Two kids are shown riding their bikes, participating in a Safe Routes to School-focused bicycle class.

Transit Education:

SacDOT can partner with SacRT to develop a simple education curriculum to teach middle and high school students the basics of reading transit maps and how to use

transit throughout Sacramento County. It should also include discussions of any available youth discounts and other fare programs.

Education programs can also encourage student creativity and task them with developing their own educational or promotional-related materials.

Parent Guardian Education:

Including parent/guardian-focused educational activities through Safe Routes to Schools programming increases community safety and can help promote a culture of walking and biking to school. Parent/guardian education can take many forms including flyers, a recurring section in a school newsletter, short videos, sessions during back-to-school night, school events, PTA meetings, and other events or meetings. Topics can include: driving tips, school drop-off/ pick-up procedures, preferred walking/biking routes, walking and biking safety tips, and others. This programming should reinforce the educational materials that their students are receiving.

A line of elementary or kindergarten students are shown learning how to safely cross the street.

ENCOURAGEMENT:

Crossing Guards:

Crossing guards are critical community assets that help make it safer and more comfortable for students and families to cross the street. Crossing guards are stationed at intersections around schools to help control traffic and improve safety in the area. Crossing guards are typically present around morning drop-off and afternoon dismissal times. A program should work with community members, schools, and school districts to determine appropriate locations and schedules. Crossing guard locations should be regularly evaluated to assign them to areas with the most need.

Pictured is a crossing guard who is all smiles, holding up a stop sign directed at traffic, allowing students to safely cross the street in Santa Clarita.

Walking School Buses and Bike Trains:

Walking School Buses and Bike Trains are organized groups of students walking or biking to school under the supervision of a guardian/adult volunteer. These groups follow predetermined routes and can operate occasionally or daily depending on interest from families. The County can support this program by offering route mapping, promotional support, equipment (i.e., a high-visibility vest for the adult chaperone), and other technical assistance.

A walking school bus in Alameda County is shown—that is, kids walk through their neighborhood towards school, accompanied by teachers and guardians in reflective gear.

Safe Passages Program:

Safe Passages programs station adult ambassadors within communities to build relationships with youth and provide them with the tools they need to stay calm and appropriately react to situations they encounter while walking and rolling. Safe Passages programs are typically run using prevention-based approaches, including supervision, community building, and de-escalation. Safe Passages programs generally are intensive programs that include a mentorship aspect between adult ambassadors and youth.

Corner Greeters:

A Corner Greeter Program is similar to a Safe Passages Program but is less structured. In a Safe Routes to School context, corner greeters help build community and place additional eyes on the street when kids walk to and from school. Corner greeters can also take on more festive and placemaking roles by setting up pop-up-style events at highly-traveled locations to engage passersby and help build community.

Community groups may sponsor Corner Greeter programs and provide volunteers to help implement events.

Suggested Route Maps:

Suggested Walking and Biking Routes to School Maps can help parents overcome traffic-related fears and lack of knowledge of family-friendly routes to school. These maps can show stop signs, traffic signals, crosswalks, paths, crossing guard locations and provide additional safety tips. These maps can also promote park-and-walk and locations, walking school buses, and bike trains.

Adopt-A-Bike:

Adopt-A-Bike combines a bicycle donation program with educational components that help teach students how to work on and maintain their new bikes. Adopt-A-Bike can also be structured as “Earn-A-Bike,” where youth learn and practice bicycle maintenance skills and, over time, earn a bicycle they built or repaired.

EVALUATION PROGRAMS:

Annual Bike/Ped Counts:

Conducting regular walking and bicycle counts is essential to understand how travel behavior is changing across the County. The counting methodology should be

consistent with other regional metrics. The County should consider selecting multiple locations across unincorporated County and count those same locations annually. These locations should include a variety of surrounding uses, densities, and contexts. If the County chooses to count the same places, it can consider installing permanent counters.

Before and after project counts are another excellent method to help judge the impacts of active transportation projects and help support future projects.

Student Travel Tallies:

Conduct annual travel tallies at participating schools to understand how mode share is changing over time. Consider making this data easily accessible to the public by posting a summary to a central Safe Routes to School website.

Parent Surveys:

Parent surveys can provide valuable insights into why students are traveling the way they are. Implement parent surveys once every two or three years to supplement travel tally data and learn additional insights about parents' concerns and perceptions of walking and bicycling.

Program Evaluation:

An annual "active transportation report card" assesses the County's progress towards Plan goals and objectives and project and program implementation. SacDOT, in coordination with the Sacramento County Bicycle Advisory Committee (SacBAC), should determine specific monitoring metrics. Commonly used metrics include: mode share, climate goals, project implementation/ network stats, and program-related stats. The report card should be presented annually to the SacBAC.

Infrastructure Programs:

Bike Rack Installation Programs:

Bike rack programs coordinate and streamline bike rack installations. This staff-managed program would develop guidelines for installation (only near commercial areas, parks, libraries, etc.) and process requests from residents and businesses. The County can install racks on sidewalks within County right-of-way. The County should establish/refresh bike rack standards and ensure that the racks selected for this program meet strong safety and security thresholds.

Bike share and Micromobility:

Bike share and micromobility (scooters, e-bikes, and other personal mobility devices) are becoming an increasingly important component of the transportation environment. These mobility devices can be personally owned and rented as part of shared mobility systems. Shared micromobility systems can be operated under many different operating models and sizes to fit the specific needs and goals of the County and the community. Implementation of these systems creates additional flexible, lower-cost transportation options within the service area. Powered micromobility devices expand the suite of alternative transportation modes that can reduce automobile dependency. They can be more readily combined with transit and human-powered transportation trips to expand transportation options.

There are six principles that should help guide micromobility systems planning and infrastructure design:

1) Advance mobility justice: Bike share and micromobility can provide users with healthy, safe and affordable transportation options that provide access to economic opportunities. Powered mobility devices can further enhance this

effect. Micromobility and bike share systems should be implemented to equitably and successfully serve EJ Communities and areas with concentrations of walking and bicycling.

2) Design for safety: Designing for safety requires identifying and prioritizing the most vulnerable roadway and trail users first, then accounting for design features that will improve safety for all users.

3) Complement the natural environment: Shared-use paths and green infrastructure components can complement the natural environment while preserving the user experience.

4) Prioritize the human experience: Micromobility and bike share specific infrastructure should strive for a consistent user experience across the County. Implementing these items should be done with a “do no harm” approach to incorporating these modes along existing active and shared modes of transportation.

5) Expand user amenities: With powered micromobility and other new and emerging modes, public charging infrastructure offers convenience while also reducing risk of “stranded” users or inoperable devices/vehicles that have lost power. Such investments can also provide public charging for motorized wheelchairs or personal phones.

6) Design for the future: New mobility and bike share staff should track trends, identify shifts in user groups, and conduct research when possible (surveys, counts, or data from vendors). Understanding these trends can help the County prepare for future investments in these areas.

Micromobility systems should include accessible vehicles within their fleets. The County and system operator should conduct targeted outreach to the appropriate stakeholder groups to better define and plan for their specific needs.

Through this program, the County should also provide dedicated scooter/ bike share parking locations. These locations should be found throughout the service area of the program and should be designed and located to minimize disruptions to other people walking, biking, and rolling.

In addition to micromobility vehicle and program design, the development of successful bike share and micromobility systems is also dependent on construction and maintenance of safe and comfortable travel facilities. Providing low-stress on- and off-street travel facilities will make traveling by bike or scooter more attractive, which will help convert trips from single occupancy vehicles and improve access to transit services for longer journeys. Comfortable on-street or trail facilities can also reduce instances of users riding on the sidewalk.

The County may consider pursuing a Bike Share or Micromobility Feasibility Study to determine where and how to implement a micromobility program in conjunction with feedback from the community.

Mobility Hubs:

Mobility hubs provide an integrated suite of mobility services, amenities, and technologies to enable seamless multi-modal trips. Mobility hubs most often prioritize transit connections, but not all mobility hubs are directly co-located with transit. In practice, mobility hubs develop as a collection of elements that make it easier to access the shared and active mobility network. These elements can be mixed and matched to create a customized, hyper-local transportation terminal.

Mobility hubs are typically designed with four primary objectives:

1) Increase access and convenience of multiple modes of transportation while reducing single occupancy vehicle trips.

2) Create a more seamless, desirable experience for transit-linked trips.

3) Manage private mobility services to align with local goals.

4) Support other County/ community goals including urban design improvements, community development, and economic development.

Mobility hubs typically include elements from these four areas:

- Transit and trip making services. (ticket vending, pick up/drop off areas, transit stops)
- Parking and charging stations for micromobility and shared mobility services. (can also include car share and freight/commercial cargo loading/unloading areas)
- Safe, prioritized access for people walking, rolling, or bicycling.
- Amenities. (community space, retail opportunities, activated furnishing and walking/biking support infrastructure)

Wayfinding:

Wayfinding signs provide important destination, distance, and navigation information to roadway users. Specific wayfinding signs designed for people walking and bicycling should be implemented at key locations across the County to support active transportation further.

Tactical Urbanism and Slow Streets/ School Streets:

Tactical Urbanism/Demonstration Projects are short-term, temporary installations of infrastructure that allow the jurisdiction and community to “test out” different roadway configurations/ infrastructure treatments before detailed design and permanent construction. Demonstration projects can last anywhere from one day to several months, depending on the project's objectives and data collection/ observation needs.

These projects are also a great way to add a placemaking element by adding public art, decorative crosswalks, or other community-inspired features.

Slow Streets and School Streets are streets with either limited or closed access to motor vehicle traffic to provide more space and safety for people walking and biking. These streets allow all modes to mix within the roadway area. Slow Streets that front schools can be considered School Streets and designed with school- and student-specific treatments that account for arrival and dismissal travel needs.

Neighborhood Traffic Management Program:

SacDOT's Neighborhood Traffic Management Program (NTMP) strives to improve safety and the quality of life for residents by reducing speeds and reckless driving on neighborhood streets. The NTMP provides a toolbox of solutions that County staff can consider when working with communities to improve neighborhood safety. Improvements are implemented through a five-step process: 1) plan initiation/application, 2) data collection and analysis, 3) funding approval, 4) plan development and support, and 5) implementation. More information on the NTMP can be found on SacDOT's website.

Quick Build:

Some infrastructure components like curb extensions and medians can be implemented faster in the short- to medium-term using quick build strategies and materials. Materials typically include paint, thermoplastic, and bollards/delineators (or other sturdy but removable materials). These improvements share many of the safety benefits as their permanent counterparts. They can be implemented faster and cheaper, allowing the County to be more responsive to safety concerns while still planning for long-term funding and implementation.

Chapter 6: Implementation and Funding:

The chapter cover photo has a street with cones and a merging sign, indicating there is road work ahead.

This chapter describes the process for evaluating and funding project recommendations to help Sacramento County prioritize projects. The County incorporated community feedback and support for projects throughout the prioritization process.

Pictured is a cyclist riding on a trail.

Infrastructure Project Prioritization Methodology:

The project prioritization process includes the following steps:

- Identification of categories: Development of prioritization categories that align with the identified goals for the active transportation plan.
- Weighting of Criteria: Establish the weighting of each prioritization metric.
- Project Scoring and Calibration: Score the projects using the identified metrics and weights. Recalibrate the weighting, if necessary, to ensure project weighting accurately reflects the stated goals.

Prioritization Categories:

Prioritization categories respond to a range of local needs. See Figure 22 below for the categories. Using the defined categories and weights, projects received a score between 0 (low value) and 5 (high value). For full details on the prioritization methodology, please see Appendix D.

Figure 22. Prioritization Methodology Weighting:

A bar graph shows how each category representing local needs is weighted. Some questions and concerns that fall under these categories are included:

SAFETY AND COMFORT: 40%.

> Does the project improve an area where people walking and biking have been injured in the past? Does it make an area more comfortable to walk, bike, or roll?

CONNECTIVITY AND ACCESS: 30%.

> Does the project improve connectivity to a school or transit stop? Does it improve the connectivity of the regional pedestrian and bicycle networks?

IMPLEMENTATION: 20%.

> How complex and feasible is the project?

EQUITY: 10%.

> Is the project located within an Environmental Justice Community or improve access to important community destinations for EJ Community residents?

Prioritization Results:

PEDESTRIAN PROJECTS:

Prioritized pedestrian projects include 66 pedestrian spot improvements and 32 miles of sidewalk gap closures. Priority pedestrian spot improvements scored 3.75 or better of 5 points. Prioritized sidewalk improvements scored 3.5 or better. The Plan also prioritized locations that provide essential connections and access options for Sacramento County residents. Closing these intersection barriers or “gaps” within the network provides important connectivity, access, and trip choice benefits.

All prioritized spot location projects are on either a bicycle or pedestrian high-injury network (HIN) corridor. These projects will provide safety enhancements and intersection improvements across the county to all roadway users: people walking, biking, rolling, and driving. Many of the spot improvements overlap with priority sidewalk gap locations, providing more holistic streetscape improvements (and opportunities for project cost savings) for people walking in these areas. Priority sidewalk gap locations are primarily along arterial and collector streets. Building these sidewalks will help fill important gaps in the pedestrian network, improving overall connectivity and access. Figure 23 displays the prioritized pedestrian and sidewalk gap closure projects. Table D-3 in Appendix D provides prioritization scoring for all pedestrian projects.

In Figure 23, a map of Prioritized Pedestrian Projects is presented. Select areas are categorized into the following: Priority Sidewalk Gap Recommendations, Additional Sidewalk Gap Recommendations, Priority Intersection Recommendations, and Additional Intersection Recommendations. The High Injury Network for both Bike and Pedestrian is also identified.

BICYCLE PROJECTS:

Prioritized bicycle projects represent 190 miles of projects that will enhance safety, improve connectivity, and close critical gaps in the bicycle network, as shown in Appendix D. Study corridors were scored as separated bikeway (Class 4) recommendations. Priority projects received a composite score of 3.75 or higher, or filled a gap in the bicycle network between priority projects and existing bikeways.

Prioritized projects represent recommendations on local, collector, and arterial roads across Sacramento County. Combined, these projects form a connected network of facilities that will close important gaps in the network and help provide continuous access on designated bicycle facilities to essential destinations within neighborhoods and other parts of the County. There are prioritized bicycle projects on most bicycle-HIN corridors. These critical safety improvements can make bicycling to more places more practical for people of varying ages and abilities. Prioritized projects include various project types, including trails, bicycle lanes, bicycle boulevards, and corridor studies of varying complexities. A diverse group of prioritized projects allows the County to move forward with bicycle network improvements on multiple fronts. Including study corridors in the analysis also guides the County on which of these more complex projects should be studied first.

Figure 24 displays the prioritized bicycle projects. Table D-5 in Appendix D provides prioritization scoring for all bicycle projects.

In Figure 24, a map of Prioritized Bicycle Projects is shown. Bicycle Recommendations are identified, and are categorized into Priority Recommendations and Additional Recommendations. Again, the High Injury Network for Bike and Pedestrian is displayed.

Project Funding:

Funding Strategy:

Identifying and securing funding for programs and infrastructure recommendations is essential to achieving the goals established in this Plan. The following section contains detailed descriptions of local, regional, state, and federal funding opportunities. Table 06 below breaks down funding sources by eligible project types (planning, design, constructions, programs, etc.).

Project priority is only one consideration when pursuing grant opportunities. The County considers both the priority and the grant criteria in determining the project or projects to pursue for any grant funding. The County also considers existing or planned projects when determining infrastructure to prioritize.

Table 06: Funding Sources:

Funding Source categories will be listed first, followed by the Funding Sources themselves, and then their respective eligible project types.
(Planning/Design/Construction will be abbreviated as P/D/C)

Local and Regional Programs:

Measure A: (STA)

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,

- Studies.

SACOG Regional Program: (SACOG)

- D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,
- Studies.

SACOG Active Transportation Program:

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,
- Studies.

Sustainable Transportation Equity Project: (CARB)

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections.

Transportation Development Act Article 3: (SACOG)

- D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections.

New Developments/Resurfacing Projects: (Sacramento County)

- D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Crossing/Intersections.

Assessment Districts: (Sacramento County)

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,
- Studies.

Impact Fees: (Sacramento County)

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,

- Studies.

SACOG Community Design Funding Program:

- D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections.

SACOG Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program:

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,
- Studies.

SACOG Innovative Mobility Program:

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,
- Studies.

Statewide and Federal Grant Programs:

Active Transportation Program: (CTC)

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,
- Studies.

Sustainable Transportation Planning Grants: (Caltrans)

- P,
- Studies.

Highway Safety Improvement Program: (Caltrans)

- D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections.

Solutions for Congested Corridors: (CTC)

- C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Crossing/Intersections.

Office of Traffic Safety: (CA OTS)

- Programs.

Recreational Trails Program: (CA DPR)

- C,
- Trails.

Affordable Housing & Sustainable Communities: (CA HCD)

- C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Programs.

Urban Greening Grants: (CA NRA)

- C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit.

Statewide Park Program: (CA DPR)

- C,
- Trails.

Trade Corridor Enhancement Program: (CTC)

- C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,
- Crossing/Intersections.

USHUD Community Development Block Grant Program:

- P/D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Trails,

- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections,
- Programs,
- Studies.

Other State Funds:

Local Partnership Program: (CTC)

- C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit,
- Crossing/Intersections.

Road Maintenance and Rehabilitation Program: (Controller's Office)

- D/C,
- On-Street Bikeways & Sidewalks,
- Safe Routes to School,
- Safe Routes to Transit.

Funding Sources:

This section provides a brief overview of the available local, state, and federal funding streams for active transportation-related projects. The funding opportunities include competitive grants, impact fee/assessment district strategies, and formula-based funding methods.

LOCAL AND REGIONAL FUNDING:

Sacramento Transportation Authority (STA) Measure A:

This funding source is derived from a half-cent sales tax imposed in Sacramento County, administered by STA, and distributed to incorporated cities and unincorporated Sacramento County to fund specific transportation maintenance and projects. Measure A included three ongoing programs: Traffic Safety, Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety, and Maintenance funds. Additionally, there is a capital component to help fund large capital improvement projects identified in the Countywide Transportation Expenditure Plan.

Funds are programmed by STA.

Sacramento Area Council of Government (SACOG) Regional Program:

SACOG's Regional Program funds cost-effective transportation projects that advance the goals established in SACOG's Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS). These goals include decreasing vehicle miles traveled, increasing the number of bicycle and pedestrian trips, and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, among others. The Regional program will fund projects identified explicitly in the MTP/SCS or lump-sum category projects, such as "Bike/Ped" or "Capacity" projects. The program seeks to promote effective and efficient use of limited state and federal resources to develop and maintain the regional transportation network.

Funds are programmed by SACOG.

Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3:

TDA is administered locally by the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG). This act allocated federal funding toward transit and transportation projects, including bicycle and pedestrian facilities. 2% of the funding allocated to Sacramento County is

designated for bicycle and pedestrian projects under the TDA Local Transportation Fund (LTF).

Funds are programmed by SACOG.

Sustainable Transportation Equity Project: (STEP)

The Sustainable Transportation Equity Project (STEP) is a grant program that will provide safe, environmentally sustainable, accessible, and affordable transportation options to low-income communities and communities of color. STEP applicants can apply for either a Planning and Capacity Building grant or an Implementation Grant. The Implementation grant program will help fund the construction of new pedestrian, bicycle, and complete streets facilities.

Funds are programmed by the California Air Resources Board (CARB).

New Development or Redevelopment/Rehabilitation:

Future new development and redevelopment projects including new road construction, resurfacing, and construction projects, are one method of providing pedestrian improvements and bike facilities. To ensure that pedestrian and bicycle improvements are included in these projects, the review process must include an individual (designated active transportation coordinator) or group (bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee) to monitor the process.

Funds are programmed by Sacramento County.

Assessment Districts:

Different types of assessment districts can be used to fund the construction and maintenance of bikeway facilities. Examples include Mello-Roos Community Facility Districts, Infrastructure Financing Districts (SB 308), Open Space Districts, or Lighting

and Landscape Districts. These types of districts have specific requirements relating to the establishment and use of funds.

Funds are programmed by Sacramento County.

Impact Fees:

The Sacramento County Transportation Development Fee/Transportation Impact Fee Program (SCTDF/TIF) funds the construction of roadway and transit improvements needed to accommodate traffic and transit ridership generated by new land development allowed by the County General Plan and land use zoning through development impact fees. Assessing such fees is also a condition of receiving Measure "A" Transportation Sales Tax allocations. The County should ensure that planning policies consider bicycle and pedestrian planning, design, and construction costs to be an eligible use of these fees.

Funds are programmed by Sacramento County.

SACOG Active Transportation Program:

SACOG's Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds infrastructure and programmatic projects that support the program goals of shifting trips to walking and bicycling, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and improving public health. Competitive application cycles occur every one to two years, typically in the spring or early summer. Eligible projects include the construction of bicycling and walking facilities, safe routes to schools projects, new or expanded programmatic activities, or projects that include a combination of infrastructure and non- infrastructure components. Projects not funded through the state program (described in the next section) are eligible for regional consideration.

Funds are programmed by SACOG.

SACOG Community Design Funding Program:

The Community Design Funding Program provides funding to local jurisdictions to build placemaking projects. Projects that implement any of the seven SACOG Blueprint Principles are eligible for funding: 1) housing options; 2) transportation options; 3) infill development; 4) mixed land uses; 5) compact development; 6) preservation of natural resources; and 7) quality design.

Funds are programmed by SACOG.

SACOG Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program:

SACOG's TDM Program aims to reduce vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled using a variety of programs, services, infrastructure projects, travel strategies, and policies to change travel behavior. SACOG periodically offers TDM-focused grant opportunities to fund infrastructure and program projects that work towards TDM program goals. These include traditional grants, mini-grants, and innovations grants.

Funds are programmed by SACOG.

SACOG Innovative Mobility Program:

The Innovative Mobility Program designs and launches projects and programs that increase transportation options and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT) to make options like biking, walking, and taking transit the easy choice for all types of trips. The program has four goals: 1) reduce VMT and vehicle emissions, 2) leverage new technologies and partnerships, 3) increase access to existing transit and micromobility services, 4) inform the Metropolitan Transportation Plan/ Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS), and 5) support policies that increase access and benefit underserved communities.

Funds are programmed by SACOG.

STATE AND FEDERAL FUNDING:

California Active Transportation Program:

California's Active Transportation Program (ATP) funds infrastructure and programmatic projects that support the program goals of shifting trips to walking and bicycling, reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and improving public health. Competitive application cycles occur every one to two years, typically in the spring or early summer. Eligible projects include the construction of bicycling and walking facilities, safe routes to schools projects, new or expanded programmatic activities, or projects that include a combination of infrastructure and non-infrastructure components. Typically, no local match is required for statewide funding, though extra points are awarded to applicants who identify matching funds.

Funds are programmed by the California Transportation Commission (CTC).

Sustainable Transportation Planning Grants:

Caltrans Sustainable Transportation Planning Grants are available to communities for planning, study, and design work to identify and evaluate projects, including conducting outreach or implementing pilot projects. Communities are typically required to provide an 11.47 percent local match, but staff time or in-kind donations are eligible to be used for the match provided the required documentation is submitted.

Funds are programmed by Caltrans.

Highway Safety Improvement Program:

Caltrans offers Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grants every one to two years. Projects on any publicly owned road or active transportation facility are eligible, including bicycle and pedestrian improvements. HSIP focuses on projects that explicitly address documented safety challenges through proven countermeasures, are implementation-ready, and demonstrate cost-effectiveness.

Funds are programmed by Caltrans.

Solutions for Congested Corridors Program:

Funded by SB1, the Congested Corridors Program strives to reduce congestion in highly-traveled and congested roads through performance improvements that balance transportation improvements, community impacts, and environmental benefits. This program can fund a wide array of enhancements, including bicycle facilities and pedestrian facilities. Eligible projects must be detailed in an approved corridor-focused planning document. These projects must include aspects that benefit all modes of transportation using an array of strategies that can change travel behavior, dedicate right of way for bikes and transit, and reduce vehicle miles traveled.

Funds are programmed by the CTC.

Office of Traffic Safety:

Under the Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, five percent of Section 405 funds address non-motorized safety. These funds may be used for law enforcement training related to pedestrian and bicycle safety, enforcement campaigns, and public education and awareness campaigns.

Funds are programmed by the California Office of Traffic Safety.

Recreational Trails Program:

The Recreational Trails Program helps provide recreational trails for both motorized and non-motorized trail use. Eligible products include trail maintenance and restoration, trailside and trailhead facilities, equipment for maintenance, new trail construction, and more.

Funds are programmed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program:

The Affordable Housing and Sustainable Communities Program (AHSC) funds land-use, housing, transportation, and land preservation projects that support infill and compact development that reduces greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Projects must fall within three project area types: transit-oriented development, integrated connectivity project, or rural innovation project areas. Fundable activities include affordable housing developments, sustainable transportation infrastructure, transportation-related amenities, and program costs.

Funds are programmed by the Strategic Growth Council and implemented by the Department of Housing and Community Development.

Urban Greening Grants:

Urban Greening Grants support the development of green infrastructure projects that reduce GHG emissions and provide multiple benefits. Projects must include one of three criteria, most relevantly: reduce commute vehicle miles traveled by constructing bicycle paths, bicycle lanes, or pedestrian facilities that provide safe routes for travel between residences, workplaces, commercial centers, and schools. Eligible projects include green streets and alleyways and non-motorized urban trails that provide safe routes for travel between homes, workplaces, commercial centers, and schools.

Funds are programmed by the California Natural Resources Agency.

Habitat Conservation Fund:

The Habitat Conservation Fund Program supports projects that bring urban residents into park and wildlife areas, protect plant and animal species, and acquire and develop wildlife corridors and trails.

Funds are programmed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Statewide Park Program: (SPP)

The Statewide Park Program solicits competitive grants to fund new parks and recreation opportunities in critically underserved communities across California. Funds can be used to create and expand/renovate existing parks. All projects must include at least one “recreation feature,” which includes non-motorized trails. No match is required.

Funds are programmed by the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Trade Corridor Enhancement Program: (TCEP)

The Trade Corridor Enhancement Program provides funding for infrastructure improvements on federally designated Trade Corridors of National and Regional Significance. TCEP can fund a variety of project types as long as the project has direct nexus to improving freight system’s economic activity or vitality, improves safety, improves connectivity, and reduces community impacts.

Funds are programmed by California Transportation Commission.

USHUD Community Development Block Grant Program:

The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program provides annual grants on a formula basis to states, cities, and counties to develop healthy and sustainable urban communities by providing housing and a suitable living environment, and by expanding economic opportunities, principally for low- and moderate-income persons. CDBG can fund new infrastructure (sidewalks and roadways) and significant roadway changes (i.e., a project that could completed with sealing would not be eligible, but a project that included a new asphalt overlay would be eligible for funding). Roadway projects included as part of larger community development projects (housing, community centers, etc.) would improve scoring.

Funds are programmed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development

Cost Estimates:

Table 07 provides planning-level construction cost estimates for many pedestrian infrastructure treatments. Detailed engineering design work will be necessary to determine the specific costs of individual projects. Table D-1 in Appendix D provides construction cost estimates for recommended pedestrian projects. Table D-2 provides cost estimates for recommended sidewalk projects.

Table 07: Pedestrian Facility Construction Costs: (2021 dollars)

The Pedestrian Facility will be listed, followed by Unit, Cost (with soft costs*), and Assumptions.

*Soft costs include the following: 10% mobilization, 15% traffic control, 10% utility coordination, and 20% contingency.

Sidewalk: (6 foot)

- LF
- $28
- Includes curb and gutter.

Sidewalk: (10 foot)

- LF
- $340
- Includes curb and gutter.

Remove slip lane:

- EA

- $31,000
- Replace existing ramp and square up corner.

Advance stop pavement markings:

- EA
- $1,085
- Install STOP marking.

Advance yield pavement markings:

- No unit
- $545
- Install yield shark teeth marking.

Roadway lane striping:

- LF
- $5
- Restripe one lane per linear foot.

Crosswalks:

- EA
- $7,750
- High-visibility crosswalk.

Traffic signal:

- EA
- $465,000
- Full traffic signal.

Pedestrian hybrid beacon: (PHB)

- EA
- $232,5000
- PHB signal on two mast arms.

Curb ramp:

- EA
- $8,525
- One corner.

Curb extensions: (2 corners)

- EA
- $31,000
- Two corners.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: (RRFB)

- EA
- $38,750
- RRFBs at two approaches.

Median island: (singular)

- EA
- $12,400
- 4 by 10 foot concrete median at one crosswalk.

Median island: (SF)

- SF
- $25
- Concrete median.

No right turn on red: (sign and phasing)

- EA
- $9,300
- Install blank out sign, update signal phasing.

Update signal timing:

- EA
- $6,200
- Update signal phasing/timing.

Asphalt pavement:

- SF
- $15
- Formalize dirt path with asphalt pavement.

Table 08 provides planning-level cost estimates for each class of bicycle facility. These are planning-level cost estimates; additional detailed engineering design work will be necessary to determine specific costs of individual projects. Table D-3 in Appendix D provides cost estimates for recommended bicycle projects.

Table 08: Bicycle Facility Construction Costs: (2021 dollars)

The Bicycle Facility will be listed first, followed by the Costs per mile (with soft costs*), and Assumptions.

*Soft costs include the following: 10% mobilization, 15% traffic control, 10% utility coordination, and 20% contingency

Shared-Use Path:

- $1,636,800
- 10-foot-wide multi-use path with decomposed granite shoulders.

Bicycle Lane:

- $132,000
- Two sides of the street.

Buffered Bicycle Lane:

- $158,400
- 2 foot buffer.

Bicycle Boulevard:

- $290,400
- Traffic calming and intersection improvements.

Separated Bikeway:

- $2,059,200
- $1,848,000 for one-way facilities, $2,217,600 for bi-directional facilities.

Maintenance:

Proper maintenance of bicycle facilities, shared used paths, and sidewalks are essential for safe and comfortable use. Inadequately maintained facilities can create hazardous conditions and reduce the accessibility and connectivity of the bicycle and pedestrian networks. Providing safe, accessible, comfortable, and well-maintained walking, bicycling, and rolling facilities allows these modes to serve as viable travel options. The following section provides specific maintenance policies that the County should implement.

MAINTENANCE POLICIES:

The County should implement the following policies to expand and improve its active transportation networks while keeping them in a state of good repair, high usability, and accessibility.

• Policy 1: Identify all necessary maintenance stakeholders across Sacramento County departments and partner agencies/jurisdictions.

- Implementation Measures:

a.) Regularly coordinate to establish/update maintenance needs across the County and share resources when possible and practical.

b.) Establish a facility inspection schedule to inspect facilities and update maintenance priorities at regular intervals.

•Policy 2: Maintain designated walking and bicycling facilities to be safe, comfortable, accessible, and usable to walking, bicycling, and rolling.

- Implementation Measures:
  a.) Sweep streets regularly with priority given to roads with higher pedestrian and bicycle traffic.
  b.) Ensure the DOT has all necessary equipment to maintain all facility types, including trails and separated bikeways.
  c.) Develop a schedule to sweep separated bikeways regularly.
  d.) Trim overhanging and encroaching vegetation (or work with appropriate property owners) to maintain a clear path of travel along pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
  e.) Develop and implement an appropriate minimum paving surface standard for bicycle boulevards and other low-stress bikeways that maintain a higher safety and comfort level for active transportation users.
  f.) Update DOT repaving project selection methodology to prioritize bicycle boulevards and other low-stress bikeways to ensure that the minimum paving surface standard is maintained.
  g.) Consider prioritizing sidewalk repairs in front of qualifying residential properties based on pedestrian volumes and proximity to important community destinations like parks, schools, and libraries.
  h.) Continue working with commercial property owners to repair any damaged sidewalks in front of those properties promptly.
  i.) Incorporate maintenance needs into the design of separated bikeways to ensure proper maintenance after construction.

j.) Develop a construction mitigation policy for impacted pedestrian and bicycle facilities requiring County staff and contractors to create fully accessible detours of equivalent standards, where possible, when construction, maintenance, or other activities restrict the use of bikeways and walkways.

• Policy 3: Maintain bicycle parking and other support facilities for a more comprehensive bicycle network.

- Implementation Measures:
  a.) Develop a procedure for inspection and prompt repair/ replacement of damaged bicycle racks or other facilities in public right-of-way.
  b.) Encourage public event organizers to provide and publicize valet bicycle parking at special events. Amend the Sacramento County event permitting process to include bicycle access accommodations and parking as part of necessary traffic control provisions.

• Policy 4: Develop a communications protocol for facility closures/detours and network updates.

- Implementation Measures:
  a.) Maintain a bikeway and sidewalk status page on the DOT website. Provide notices and information on planned closures and detours.
  b.) Regularly update digital and print bicycle and trail network maps. Distribute paper maps at libraries, community centers, community events, bike shops, and other locations.
  c.) Promote Sacramento County's 3 1 1 service as an easy-to-use method for the public to report maintenance and other facility issues. 3 1 1 can also potentially be used to provide suggestions on new walking or bicycling facilities to Sacramento County DOT staff.

In addition to infrastructure maintenance, it is also crucial for the County to regularly update and maintain its Geographic Information Systems (GIS) database of projects. The County should follow the GIS update procedures listed in Appendix E.

MAINTENANCE COSTS:

Forecasting the maintenance costs of bicycle facilities is an integral part of annual budgeting processes. Table 09 provides planning-level maintenance costs for bicycle facilities broken down by facility type.

Table 09: Annual Maintenance Costs:

The Facility Type will be listed, followed by Cost per mile per year, Miles per year, Total Annual Cost, and finally, Notes on what should be maintained for each Facility Type.

Class 1 Shared Use Paths:

- $8,500 per mile per year,
- 349.1 miles per year,
- $2,967,350 total per year,
- Lighting, debris cleanup, and removal of vegetation overgrowth, patching pavement, adding decomposed granite to shoulders.

Class 2 Bicycle Lanes and Class 2B Buffered Bicycle Lanes:

- $1,500 per mile per year,
- 632.9 miles per year,
- $949.350 total per year,
- Repainting the lane strips and stencils, sign replacement as needed.

Class 3 Bicycle Route/ Boulevards:

- $1,000 per mile per year,

- 54.2 miles per year,
- $54,200 total per year,
- Sign and shared-lane stencil replacement as needed.

Class 4 Separated Bikeways:

- $4,000 per mile per year,
- 145.6 miles per year,
- $582,400 total per year,
- Debris removal, repainting stripes and stencils, sign replacement, replaced damaged barriers.

Interagency Coordination:

Some of the infrastructure recommendations in this Plan are in the rights-of-way of agencies other than Sacramento County, such as Caltrans. The County will have to coordinate with the appropriate stakeholder(s) for planning, design, funding, and implementation. These partner agencies may have the final approval on these projects, even if they are located within unincorporated Sacramento County.

Partnerships with community-based organizations and other walking and biking focuses groups will be vital for expanding active transportation programming across Sacramento County. These partners can not only help provide the programming but can also help promote them within the communities they serve.

Quick Build Projects:

Many infrastructure improvements (especially pedestrian projects and intersection geometry changes) can be completed using signage, striping, and other quick-build strategies (e.g., paint-and-post and other temporary materials). These improvements

can be left permanently or built temporarily until additional funding for design and construction can be secured for permanent, more expensive design iterations.

The Plan document closes with a back cover showing a stretch of road, a bike lane, and a sidewalk. The backs of four people riding, rolling, and walking are seen. Two cyclists are riding in the bike lane, another commuter rides her skateboard on the sidewalk, while a pedestrian—who is also on the sidewalk—walks onward. Capping it all off is the logo of Sacramento County.

End of Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan.

Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan - Appendices:

June 2022,

Funded by Caltrans Sustainable Communities Program,

The front cover of the Appendices shows a pedestrian waiting for the light to turn at a crosswalk, and two bikers in a bike lane, side-by side with a car, waiting for the green light to cross an intersection. The Great Wall of Carmichael—a mural at one of the corners of Carmichael Park facing the street—is seen in the background.

Appendices:

Appendix A:

- A-1: Existing Conditions and Technical Summary,
  Page 188;
- A-2: Safety Analysis Report,
  Page 222;
- A-3: High Injury Collisions Nearby Schools, (Quarter- Mile Radius)
  Page 258;
- A-4: High Injury Collisions Nearby Schools, (Two-Mile Radius)
  Page 264;

Appendix B:

- Community Engagement,
  Page 272;

Appendix C:

Project Recommendations and Prioritization,

Page 404;

Appendix D:

Procedure for Incorporating Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Changes into GIS,

Page 642.

Appendix A-1: Existing Conditions Technical Summary:

Chapter cover shows a bus stop with a bench, and a tree with a large canopy of pink blooming flowers.

Introduction:

COMMUNITY CONTEXT:

Sacramento County is located in the middle of the 400-mile long Central Valley, 87 miles east of San Francisco and 100 miles west of Lake Tahoe. Sacramento County has seven incorporated cities: Sacramento, Elk Grove, Citrus Heights, Folsom, Galt, Isleton, and Rancho Cordova. Three of the cities were only recently incorporated, including Citrus Heights (1997), Elk Grove (2000), and Rancho Cordova (2003). Encompassing a total of 994 square miles, the county surrounds Interstate 80 (I-80) and US Route 50 (US 50) east of Yolo County and Interstate 5 (I-5) and State Route 99 (SR 99) north of San Joaquin County and east of Solano County. Sacramento County shares borders with Sutter County and Placer County to the north and El Dorado

County to the East. The unincorporated County is well developed and densely populated along the I-80 and US 50 corridors and the northern portion of the SR 99 corridor while the remainder of the unincorporated County is more sparsely populated with land either devoted to farming or undeveloped.

The United Sates Census 2018 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates a population of 584,127 for unincorporated Sacramento County, approximately 40% of the total population of Sacramento County. The unincorporated population has grown 5.3% since the 2010 census population count and the median age for the entire county has increased from 34.8 to 36.6 over the last 10 years.

TRANSPORTATION OVERVIEW:

Based on the 2018 ACS1 (Footnote 13), there are approximately 270,000 workers 16 years or older in unincorporated Sacramento County. The majority of workers commute by car, either alone (81.3%) or carpooling (7.4%) while fewer than a percent each commute by walking (0.9%) or bicycle (0.4%). These are significantly lower than the 2012 SACOG regional averages (Footnote 14) of 2.1% commute mode share for walking and 1.8% commute mode share for biking. The average time to commute to work or unincorporated Sacramento County workers is 27.8 minutes.

The 2016 SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy document states that:

“Data on non-commute bike and walk trips is difficult to assemble for the region—estimates are dependent on relatively small sample surveys, model estimates, and anecdotal data. The table shows a significant increase in all-purpose bike and walk share, from about 7.3 to 9.1 percent. It is reasonable to assume that the recent trend in all-purpose biking and walking has been upward, given that commuting shares have increased.”

It also provides estimates for all travel for the entire SACOG region of 1.9% of trips are people bicycling and 7.2% of trips are people walking. Given that the commuting mode

split for unincorporated Sacramento County is two to four times lower than the regional averages, it is reasonable to assume that the mode split is similarly lower across all trips.

Footnote 13: Based on the total workers in Sacramento County minus the workers in each incorporated City.

Footnote 14: 2016 SACOG Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.

Multimodal Connections to Transit:

Currently Sacramento Regional Transit (SacRT) buses and light rail run through the communities, with a total annual ridership of about 21 million passengers in FY 2019. The light rail saw a weekday average ridership of 40,000, while average weekday bus ridership was 37,000 passengers per day. The majority of light rail routes run within the City of Sacramento; however, the Gold Line runs along Folsom Boulevard between Sacramento and Folsom. Three of the stations within unincorporated Sacramento County have Park & Ride lots that connect that act as a connection between the light rail, bus routes, and surrounding communities.

• Watt/Manlove Station has stops for SacRT Bus Routes 72, 84. It also connects to a Class 1 multiuse trail that provides protected crossing for US 50 and the American River, eventually connecting to regional trails that parallel the river. The station however has no secure bike parking and minimal racks.

• Butterfield Station has stops for SacRT Bus Routes 19, 78. It also connects to Class 2 facilities on Mayhew Road, which provides crossing for US 50 and connection to residential communities to the South. There is also an existing facility to the north along

a canal connecting to the American River, which is blocked by locked gates. The station however has no secure bike parking and minimal racks.

• Hazel Station, located between Rancho Cordova and Folsom, is a Park and Ride that also acts as a bus terminal but does not serve any bus routes. The station isn't connected to any nearby communities or bicycle facilities.

• Starfire Station, located off of Folsom Boulevard in the Rosemont community, is served by the Gold Line and the 84 bus route. The station has no secure bike parking and minimal racks. There are bike lanes on Folsom Boulevard.

• Tiber Station, located of Folsom Boulevard in La Riviera, is served by the Gold Line but no bus stops. The station has no secure bike parking and minimal racks. There are bike lanes on Folsom Boulevard.

There are also five Caltrans park & ride locations in Sacramento County, one of which is located in unincorporated Orangevale at the US 50 interchange with Hazel Avenue. The Hazel Avenue Park and Ride has no transit access and is located adjacent to the Jedediah Smith Memorial Trail.

Vehicle Share Programs:

The bike share company JUMP launched an all-electric assist bike share system in the city of Sacramento as well the Yolo County cities of Davis and West Sacramento, with an initial offering of 300 bikes and a planned expansion of 900 bikes during summer 2018, however none of the hubs are located in unincorporated Sacramento County or Sacramento County cities east of Sacramento. There are also recreational bike share programs run by Tower Bridge Bike Share and Practical Cycle, however they are both contained within the City of Sacramento in Sacramento County.

There was a short-lived State Employee BikeShare program available to the 230,000 workers employed by the State running in the Sacramento region, however there is no longer any information available about the program and it is assumed defunct.

The tech firm Gotcha was planning to provide bike- and scooter-share programs and equipment for Elk Grove, Folsom, and Rancho Cordova in Fall 2019, however the program was delayed due to increasing tariffs. While originally planned for a delayed rollout during Spring 2020 these programs may have been further delayed by the COVID-19 pandemic (Footnote 15).

There are no bike- or scooter- share programs in unincorporated County locations, however as of May 2017, the Sacramento Air Quality Management District (AQMD) has administered the Our Community CarShare Sacramento Program (Footnote 16), which is available to low-income Sacramento County residents and operates in currently operates in seven lower-income.

Active transportation is enjoyed by people of all ages and abilities. However, the perception of safety, lack of facilities or effective routes, or natural constraints such as heat and the presence of hilled terrain can contribute to a person's unwillingness to walk or ride a bike. As such, users of all capabilities need to be considered when developing or expanding the active transportation network. Outside of improving the network, support through education and encouragement programs can be utilized to improve confidence in the system and increase facility use.

Footnote 15:

https://www.sacbee.com/news/local/article233636962.html (referenced July 2020.)

Footnote 16: https://www.sacbreathe.org/(referenced July 2020.)

Active Transportation Supporting Policies:

Current active transportation supporting policies, documentation, and plans have been reviewed. Each document differs in overarching focus and approach related to the most relevant active transportation needs in the area, however general commonalities are present. Policies, goals, and actions most commonly identified in these documents generally relate to the following:

- Invest in bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure as healthy transportation options.
- Improve safety for cyclists and pedestrians.
- Increase and improve access to employment, economic centers, and environmental justice communities.
- Establish and expand education, encouragement, enforcement, and evaluation programs.
- Collaboration with nearby jurisdictions to support a regional bicycle network.
- Prioritize projects that improve access to environmental justice communities, improve safety, close gaps in the network, or are low cost or privately funded improvements.

Some of the specific sources of policies and programs that will shape active transportation in Sacramento County include:

- Federal Highway Administrative. (FHWA).
- American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials. (AASHTO).
- Americans with Disabilities Act. (ADA).
- Federal and California State Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. (M U T C D and CA M U T C D).

- The State of California.
- Sacramento Area Council of Governments. (SACOG).

Sacramento County has many desirable characteristics to support active transportation. While temperatures rise above what might be desirable at times during the summer, the warm and dry climate of the region encourages people to walk and ride bicycles throughout the year. Most of the land in the County is generally flat, which provides an environment for those who are less confident and less able to more easily travel longer distances without tiring. The larger cities in the County are often divided by stretches with little development. This is both a constraint and an opportunity in that while regional trails longer than a few miles may be more daunting for pedestrians and less skilled or able bicycle riders, longer trails may provide sought after routes for avid cyclists and users seeking exercise.

There are currently 280 miles of existing bicycle infrastructure in the Unincorporated Region consisting of 61 miles of Class 1, 209 miles of Class 2 and 11 miles of Class 3 bike lanes. The total existing sidewalks add up to 1,950 miles. A total of 1,077 miles of bikeways were proposed in the previous plan, of which six miles of Class 2 bike lanes have been built: four miles along Garfield Avenue from Fair Oaks Boulevard to Greenback Lane, and two miles along California Avenue from Oak Avenue to Jan Drive. Existing and proposed bicycle infrastructure is shown in Figure A-1 and Figure A-2.

The following funding opportunities have been identified as potential sources for the active transportation plan:

- Caltrans Sustainable Communities Planning Grants.
- Trails and Greenways.
- Blue Sky Grant Program.
- Cap and Trade – Affordable Housing Sustainable Communities.
- Office of Traffic Safety – Bicycle and Pedestrian Safety Grants.
- Federal Lands Access Program – CA.

- SACOG Regional Funding Programs.
- State Active Transportation Program Cycle 5.
- Regional Active Transportation Program Cycle 5.

Figure A-1. Existing Bicycle Facilities.

A map shows the existing facility classes for bicycles in Sacramento County. The following are identified: Existing Class 1, Existing Class 2, Existing Class 3, and areas where there is no existing bike facility. Unincorporated areas of the County are shaded.

SUMMARY:

Active transportation in rural settings is also an area of weakness in active transportation plans in the region. The low density in the southern portion of the county creates a network void of connected facilities and requires long distances to travel to reach destinations. As a result, the pedestrian mode share is far lower than suburban areas. The bicycle mode share also suffers as most facilities that do exist are located on high speed, narrow roadways. While improvements to the pedestrian network may not prove fruitful, this situation does provide the opportunity to improve and expand the bicycle network.

There are ample opportunities in suburban areas of the County to improve connectivity. Both pedestrian and bicycle networks can be expanded to ensure gapless connections to transit routes and to create desirable routes to key destinations within walking distances. Active transportation in the County would be made further desirable by

offering support facilities such as water fountains for pedestrians and dedicated bicycle parking facilities for bicyclists at key destinations.

Figure A-2. Proposed Bicycle Facilities.

A map shows the different Proposed Facility Class types for Bicycles in Sacramento County: Class 1 (or multi-use trails), Class 2 (or bike lanes), Class 3 (or bike routes), Class 4 (or protected bike lanes). Unincorporated areas of the County are shaded.

Demand: Where do people want to go?

SACRAMENTO COUNTY COMMUNITIES:

The Sacramento County Planning department has defined community boundaries throughout the County (Footnote 18) as shown in Figure A-3. The highest density communities include Arden Arcade, Carmichael, Fair Oaks, Orangevale, Rio Linda/Elverta, South Sacramento, and Vineyard. The Sacramento County Environmental Justice Element also identifies communities that are considered disadvantaged compared to other parts of unincorporated County based on California Communities Environmental Health Screening Tool (CalEnviroScreen), which identified communities based on socioeconomic and environmental characteristics, and the Sacramento Area Council of Governments (SACOG) Metropolitan Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (MTP/SCS).

Most people that walk or bike to work in Sacramento County are concentrated within the incorporated cities. The American River/US 50 corridor provides multiple ways to travel with trails, and transit providing alternatives to the Freeway and a dense grid of

pedestrian and bicycle facilities for travel within communities. This is apparent with the highest commute mode split for walking occurring in Folsom (3.0%), City of Sacramento (2.9%), and Rancho Cordova (1.7%) while the other cities and unincorporated County show less than a percent of commute mode share for walking. Bicycle use for commuting is even more concentrated in the City of Sacramento (2.0%) while all other cities and unincorporated County show less than a percent of commute mode share for biking. This comes from a lower density of facilities and more gaps in the network.

Footnote 18: https://planning.saccounty.net/Pages/PlanningandCommunityMaps.aspx .

Employment:

The eight largest employers of Sacramento County residents are a mix of public and private sector and are mainly located within incorporated cities, showing the importance of regional bicycle and pedestrian facilities for commute access. The number of local employees by employer is included in Table A-1. This shows the sectors responsible for the majority of employment in Sacramento County are Government and Health Care. This is confirmed to be true for unincorporated County residents as well, as shown in Table A-2, which shows the sectors that employ the highest proportion of residents (Footnote 19) from unincorporated Sacramento County. A map of job density within Environmental Justice communities is shown in Figure A-5. The lowest job density for those communities occurs throughout North Vineyard and the west portion of North Highlands.

Footnote 19: https://onthemap.ces.census.gov/ .

Figure A-3. Sacramento County Communities.

This map shows the Community boundaries in Sacramento County, with each Community assigned a different shade. The following are the communities that encompass the County: Antelope, Arden Arcade, Carmichael, Citrus Heights, Cosumnes, Delta, Downtown, East City, Elk Grove, Fair Oaks, Folsom Area, Franklin/Laguna, Galt, Land Park/Pocket/Meadowview, North Highlands/Foothill Farms, North Natomas, North Sacramento, Orangevale, Rancho Cordova, Rancho Murieta, Rio Linda/Elverta, South Natomas, South Sacramento, Southeast, and Vineyard. Incorporated Areas have a second layer of shading to differentiate from unincorporated areas.

Government and health services are the main sources of employment in the County and the majority of employment locations are located in cities along the US 50 corridor.

Table A-1: Top Sacramento County Employers:

The employer will be listed first, followed by the number of Sacramento County Employees (Footnote A and B), the Address, and Type of Business/Service.

State of California:

- 77,172 Employees from the County.
- Various.
- Government.

Kaiser Permanente:

- 15,585 Employees from the County.
- Various.

- Health Care System.

UC Davis Health:

- 14,510 Employees from the County.
- 2315 Stockton Blvd Sacramento.
- Health Care System.

Sacramento County:

- 12,360 Employees from the County.
- 700 H Street Sacramento.
- County Government.

Sutter Health:

- 10,764 Employees from the County.
- 2200 River Plaza Drive Sacramento.
- Health Care System.

Dignity Health:

- 9,033 Employees from the County.
- 3400 Data Drive Rancho Cordova.
- Health Care System.

Intel Corp:

- 6,200 Employees from the County.
- 1900 Prairie City Road Folsom.
- Research and Development.

Raley's:

- 6,200.
- Various.
- Grocery Store.

Footnote A: https://www.bizjournals.com/sacramento/subscriber-only/2020/07/03/employers-private-sector.html (July 3, 2020.)

Footnote B: https://www.bizjournals.com/sacramento/subscriber-only/2020/05/29/employers-sacramento-county.html (May 29, 2020.)

Table A-2: Top Industries that Employ Unincorporated Residents:

Rank will be listed, followed by the N A I C S Industry Sector, and share of unincorporated employed residents.

1 – Health Care and Social Assistance.
16.40%.

2 – Retail Trade.
10.70%.

3 – Public Administration.
10.30%.

4 – Accommodation and Food Services.
9.10%.

5 – Educational Services.
8.20%.

6 – Administration & Support, Waste Management and Remediation.
6.90%.

7 – Construction.

6.10%.

8 – Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services.
6.10%.

9 – Manufacturing.
4.40%.

10 – Finance and Insurance.
3.90%.

Figure A-5. Top Sacramento County Employers.

A map presents the density of jobs in environmental justice communities—North Highlands, West Arden-Arcade, South Sacramento, and North Vineyard—categorized into five levels of density. The areas with the highest job density is around the center of North Highlands, a few areas in the center and southern area of West Arden-Arcade, and the northern and mid-east regions of South Sacramento. The area with the least job density is the west region of North Highlands, the far east region of South Sacramento, and the entirety of North Vineyard.

High Intensity Land Use: (Existing and Planned)

Currently, the most intense land uses, including dense residential and commercial development, in the Unincorporated region are spread across the north and east of the

county. Commercial uses are mainly lined along major streets such as Watt Avenue, Auburn Boulevard, Howe Avenue and Stockton Boulevard.

Undeveloped land that has been zoned for high density residential and commercial units will generate transportation needs in the future. These will be potentially planned at the following locations:

• Shopping center south of Winding Way and east of Manzanita Avenue.

• Business and professional offices along Madison Avenue and Harrison Street.

• Businesses along Walerga Road at Antelope Road.

• Multifamily residential, shopping centers and businesses along Elverta Road and 16th Street.

• Multifamily residential along U Street and Elverta Rail Way.

• Multifamily residential along Antelope Road at Monument Drive and along Don Julio Boulevard.

• Multifamily residential along Antelope North Road.

• Multifamily residential east of Sunrise Blvd at Gold Express Drive.

Key Destinations:

Major travel generators and neighborhood destinations include schools, libraries, parks, commercial corridors, downtown and civic buildings. As shown in Figure A-6, these are generally located across the north and northeast parts of the county, as well as in South Sacramento. The Arden- Arcade area is a major shopping hub, with several other shopping centers along Fair Oaks Boulevard and Sunrise Boulevard.

There are a total of 158 schools in the Unincorporated region, with 17 in Carmichael, 17 in South Sacramento, 13 in North Highlands, 11 in Antelope, 10 in Orangevale, 9 in Fair

Oaks, 8 in Rio Linda, and the rest spread across other parts of the county. School traffic is typically generated around 7 am to 9 am and from 2 pm to 4 pm on weekdays.

Major medical facilities include Kaiser Healthcare in Arden-Arcade and South Sacramento, VA Hospital in North Highlands, and several other specialty care services in Carmichael, Fair Oaks and Orangevale.

Popular public libraries are the Arcade Community library, Arden-Dimick library, Carmichael Regional library, North Highlands/Antelope library, Fair Oaks and Orangeville library.

As mentioned earlier, commercial corridors line the arterial streets in eastern North Highlands, Carmichael, throughout Arden-Arcade, Orangevale along Greenback Lane, and South Sacramento along Stockton Boulevard and Franklin Boulevard. These usually generate trips in the evening on weekdays, and mostly over the weekends. American River Parkway, Dry Creek Parkway, Folsom Lake state recreational area, Del Paso regional park and Cosumnes river preserve are among the big parks of the region. Several small parks like the Arcade Creek park, Antelope Community park.

Gibbons Community park and Mission North park, among others are spread across the county. Parks form important hubs of internal active transportation, especially those parks that support bicycling and walking via trails.

Figure A-6. Key Destinations in Unincorporated Sacramento County.

In this map, the following key destinations are marked: Major Bus Stops, Medical Health Facilities, Shopping Centers, and Libraries.

Connectivity: Can residents and visitors get to where they want to go by walking or bicycling?

EXISTING INFRASTRUCTURE:

The Unincorporated region of the County has a mix of Class 1, Class 2 and Class 3 bicycle infrastructure; however, the network is discontinuous in most areas. While the majority of the roads in North Highlands and South Sacramento communities have connected sidewalks, significant gaps can be noticed in West Arden-Arcade and North Vineyard (Figure A-7 and Figure A-8).

While bikeways compensate for the lack of sidewalks in these communities to some extent, adequate direct connectivity is not provided by the bicycle infrastructure. In the north, bike lanes are absent on Madison Avenue, and discontinuous on Palm Avenue, resulting in poor east-west connectivity from and to North Highlands. The connectivity along Watt Avenue is also broken due to missing stretches of bike lanes between Elkhorn Boulevard and Don Julio Boulevard in North Highlands, and between Madison Avenue and Arden Way in West Arden-Arcade. Alternative direct bike routes or lanes are not available.

In the south Sacramento communities, bike lanes exist along major roads on Franklin Boulevard and Stockton Boulevard, providing north-south connections. However, Florin Road lacks adequate length of bicycle infrastructure, and only one discontinuous alternative bike Lane along 53rd Avenue in the east-west direction. Stockton Boulevard has missing lengths of bike lanes between 21st Avenue and Fruitridge Road, and between Lemon Hill Avenue and Riza Avenue.

The western edge of North Vineyard has bike lanes along South Watt Avenue and Elk Grove-Florin Road, and a short stretch can be found along Bradshaw Road. No bike

lanes can be found in the City of Isleton and Galt. Sidewalks and bikeways are present adjacent to major bus stations at American College on College Oak Drive, and at Florin Towne Center on Stockton Boulevard.

CONNECTIVITY OF KEY DESTINATIONS:

Key destinations such as schools and medical facilities are surrounded by sidewalks or bikeways but lack continuous links to most residential areas. Nine schools and one hospital within the unincorporated region were identified that lack any sidewalks and bicycle infrastructure within 750 feet of the site. These are listed below:

School Sites Lacking Adequate Active Transportation Infrastructure:

- Heritage Peak Charter.
- Pathways Community Day.
- C. W. Dillard Elementary.
- Franklin Elementary.
- Cosumnes River Elementary.
- Sierra-Enterprise Elementary.
- Alpha Charter.
- Alpha Technology Middle.
- Arcohe Elementary.

Medical Facility Lacking Adequate Active Transportation Infrastructure:

- Altua. (Galt).

Out of 76 medical facilities, 30 do not have access to a bus stop for an eighth of a mile, and 10 of these do not have access to bus stops for at least a quarter mile. These include:

- Cornerstone.

- Walnut Whitney Convalescent Hospital.
- Greater Sacramento Surgery Center.
- Altua.
- Eskaton Village Care Center.
- Eskaton Home Care.
- New Dawn Recovery Center.
- Sunbridge Brittany Care Center.
- Koinonia Group Homes.
- Sacramento Area Emergency Housing Center.

Parks in North Vineyard do not have any access to either bikeways, or bus stops. Parks in other parts are fairly well connected by bus services but lack bikeway connectivity. Bike trails exist along the American River Parkway and the Dry Creek Parkway.

The Rancho Cordova community library, the Courtland Community library and the Walnut Grove branch library are not connected by either bicycle infrastructure or bus stops.

Regional and Community Connections:

The Sacramento Regional Transit Light Rail connects parts of the county to Sacramento City downtown. The blue line extends north from the city center to Watt Avenue/I-80 interchange in the southern part of North Highlands. In the south, it extends to Cosumnes River College. The gold line stretches east all the way to Folsom via Rancho Cordova. None of these lines provide direct connectivity to or between the identified environmental justice communities.

Communities along US 50 have access to the gold line light rail, Folsom Boulevard bike lanes, as well as Jedediah Smith Memorial Trail. Likewise, communities living along I-80 in northern West Arden-Arcade have access to the blue line and the Edison Avenue bike lanes. In the north-south direction along Watt Avenue, bus routes 26, 82 and 84 operate along with intermittent bike lanes, connecting the northern county to Arden-Arcade. The American River College bus terminal as well as the Watt/I-80 RT station in the north facilitate these connections. The Florin Towne Center in South Sacramento provide connections to bus routes 51, 61, 68 and 81 that expand connections to Sacramento downtown in the north, Cosumnes River College in the south, and loops along multiple communities.

Figure A-7. Sidewalks in North Highlands and West Arden-Arcade.

Figure A-8. Sidewalks in South Sacramento and North Vineyard.

On these maps, all the existing sidewalks are highlighted, with Community borders outlined.

Bicycle Parking:

Sacramento County Zoning Code Section 5.9.9B sets the minimum bicycle parking requirements by land use. These are shown in Table A-3. There are two types of bicycle parking–short term and long term. Short term bicycle parking in the form of bike racks are typically used for up to two hours, for example a trip to a store or a library. Long term parking is provided for several hours at employment centers, schools and transit hubs. These tend to provide high security through bike cages, lockers or bike rooms. Bicycle parking in the County is typically provided at parks, schools and commercial developments, and specific locations are provided in the County Bicycle Master Plan. Figure A-9 shows bicycle parking demand in unincorporated areas of Sacramento County.

The Sacramento County General Plan, Transit Oriented Development Design Guidelines state that transit stops, commercial areas and other key destinations must provide adequate parking to support bicycle use. Secure and safe bicycle storage areas are recommended. None of the unincorporated communities have established bicycle parking programs however.

Figure A-9. Bike Parking Demand.

This map shows areas where demand for bike parking is high across the unincorporated County.

Table A-3: County Bicycle Parking Facility Requirements: (Zoning Code)

Use will be listed first, followed by Bicycle Spaces, and then Bicycle Parking Facility Class.

Use: All commercial, mixed- use, and service uses not otherwise listed.

Space:

- Long-term: One bicycle space for every 30 vehicle spaces required or two spaces, whichever is greater.
- Short-term: One bicycle space for every 30 vehicle spaces required or two spaces, whichever is greater.

Class:

- Long-Term: Class 1 lockers, or Class 2 racks in an enclosed lockable area.
- Short-Term: Class 2 or Class 3 racks.

Use: Dinner restaurants, cocktail lounges.

Space:

- Long-term: One bicycle space for every 50 vehicle spaces required or two spaces, whichever is greater.
- Short-term: One bicycle space for every 30 vehicle spaces required or two spaces, whichever is greater.

Class:

- Long-Term: Class 1 lockers, or Class 2 racks in an enclosed lockable area.
- Short-Term: Class 2 or Class 3 racks.

Use: Industrial.

Space:

- Long-term: One bicycle space for every 50 vehicle spaces required or two spaces.
- Short-term: 0.

Class:

- Long-Term: Class 1 lockers, or Class 2 racks in an enclosed lockable area.
- Short-Term: N/A.

Use: Office and institutional uses within commercial and industrial zoning districts.

Space:

- Long-term: One bicycle space for every 30 vehicle spaces required or two spaces, whichever is greater.
- Short-term: One bicycle space for every 60 vehicle spaces required or two spaces, whichever is greater.

Class:

- Long-Term: Class 1 lockers, or Class 2 racks in an enclosed lockable area.
- Short-Term: Class 2 or Class 3 racks.

Use: Institutional uses in other zoning districts.

- Bicycle parking shall be determined at the time of issuance of a Conditional Use Permit.

Use: Multiple Family.

Space: (Long-term and Short-term.)

- For multifamily housing, a minimum of one (1) bicycle parking space per unit shall be provided on-site, with guest bicycle parking spaces provided at one (1) space per 10 units on-site.

Class: (Long-term and Short-term.)

- Class 1 lockers or Class 2 racks shall be located close to and with direct access to multifamily buildings entries. Bicycle parking for guests shall be clustered in common areas for easy convenience.

Equity: Does everyone have equitable access to walking and bicycle infrastructure?

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHICS:

The Sacramento County Environmental Justice Element identifies the North Highlands/Foothill Farms, West Arden-Arcade, South Sacramento, and North Vineyard communities as disadvantaged compared to other parts of unincorporated County based on socioeconomic and environmental characteristics. The goals of identifying these communities is to ensure that the built environment provides an equitable degree of protection from environmental and health hazards and to encourage participation from all members of the community in the decision making process by addressing inequities that can lead to less participation from EJ communities.

Each of the identified communities has a unique character that must be considered when planning public outreach events and prioritizing projects and community investment:

• While all of the EJ communities have a relatively similar land area, South Sacramento is a very dense community with 67,362 residents and North Vineyards is very low density with only 1,733 residents and primarily rural agricultural.

• North Highlands and South Sacramento Communities have a higher percentage of persons under 20 while West Arden Arcade has a higher percentage of persons over 60.

• While unincorporated Sacramento County has a significantly higher population of White residents when compared to California and the City of Sacramento, South Sacramento has a higher proportion of persons of Asian or Hispanic/Latino origin.

• Spanish is the second most common primary language in EJ communities and occurs at a much higher rate than broader Sacramento County. Other common languages include Russian in North Highlands/Foothill Farms, Hmong and Chinese in South Sacramento, and Vietnamese in North Vineyard.

• Median Household income is much lower in EJ communities than in Sacramento County and especially when compared to non-EJ communities.

RELIANCE ON ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION AND CONNECTIVITY:

The Element focuses on access to healthy food (grocers with fresh produce, food banks, and Farmer's Markets) as a primary goal. It identifies West Arden Arcade and South Sacramento as the regions with the highest rates of food insecurity, representing limited or uncertain access to acquire acceptable food in socially acceptable ways. The policies relevant to this effort include urbanized communities having access to food sources within a quarter mile of transit. Another focus area is opportunities for physical activity to combat obesity rates, which are highest in West Arden Arcade, North

Highlands/Foothill Farms, and South Sacramento. Metrics include miles of Class 1 facilities per 1,000 residents, which are much lower in EJ communities than in non- EJ communities, and miles of Class 2 facilities per 1,000 residents, which are lowest in West Arden-Arcade. North Vineyard has significantly higher density of Class 2 lanes than anywhere else in the County, however it also has the lowest occurrence of residences within a quarter mile of a park due to its agricultural context and low density. Metrics also includes rates of collisions involving people walking or riding bikes per 1,000 residents, which are higher in EJ communities than non-EJ communities. The relevant policies include requiring smart growth streets and encouraging safe, low stress environments for pedestrians and bicyclists in EJ communities.

Safety: Can residents and visitors walk or bike safely and comfortably?

SAFETY:

Pedestrian and bicyclists comprise the most vulnerable road users, meaning they are more prone to higher injury severities in case of a collision. This level of vulnerability is a significant factor that affects their decision to use a motorized transportation mode if they perceive their safety and comfort is compromised. Research has also shown that one's perception of safety and comfort contributes significantly to willingness to walk or bike. Specifically, walking and biking on busy roads and crossing busy urban intersections adjacent to high-speed vehicular traffic can easily deter people from walking and biking. Enhancing the safety and comfort perception of non-motorized road users can be attained by decreasing their interaction with vehicular traffic through improved infrastructure. Therefore, creating safer and more comfortable environment for walking and biking should be one of the main goals of the Active Transportation Plan. A systemic-safety approach was used to identify trends for collisions involving people walking or biking throughout Unincorporated Sacramento County. This analysis reports

on both the total number of collisions and collisions that result in a fatality or severe injury (KSI) as well as making use of the Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) (Footnote 20) method, which provides an average severity score across different categories, allowing for direct comparison of collision types without comprehensive traffic volume data. This method is based on a weighting factor, as shown in Table A-4, to assign a severity score based on FHWA and Caltrans guidance. For more information on the methodology of the collision analysis, as well as a more detailed summary of the results, see the Safety Analysis Report after this summary.

Footnote 20: 2010 Highway Safety Manual. (HSM)

Table A-4: EPDO Weighting Factor by Collision Severity:

Collision Severity will be listed first, followed by any subcategories, and finally the EPDO Factor will be stated.

Fatal and Severe Injury:

- Signalized Intersection – 120.
- Non-Signalized Intersection – 190.
- Roadway – 165.

Injury (Other Visible) – 11.

Injury (Complaint of Pain) – 6.

Property Damage Only (PDO) – 1.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Collision Summary:

A review of collision data in Unincorporated Sacramento County for the years 2015-2019 identified 50,832 collisions out of which 2,038 collisions involved someone walking or biking. The key trends and deficiencies identified from the analysis summarized in this document provide a direction of programs and improvements to consider as part of this Plan. A summary of these trends and deficiencies for collisions involving people walking and biking are as follows:

• Pedestrians are shown to be the most vulnerable users, with similar frequency of crashes but much higher crash severities.

• The proportion of collisions involving people walking and biking happen ten times more frequently than the proportion of people commuting by walking or biking.

• Many more collisions occur at intersections, however collisions occurring along segments are more severe both for people walking and biking.

• Within school zones, collisions involving people walking and biking result in less severe injuries, even more so for collisions involving school-age children.

• The highest severity collisions involving people biking on a bicycle facility is at Class 1 roadway crossings.

Table A-5 provides a summary of the number and severity of collisions base on mode and location type as well as a comparison to crashes that don't include people walking or biking.

Table A-5: Collision Frequency and Severity by Type: (2015—2019)

Collision Type will be listed first; other column headings will be stated below.

Pedestrian Collisions:

- Frequency: 1,000.
- KSI: 348.
- EPDO: 60,852.
- EPDO per Collision: 60.9.

Bicycle Collisions:

- Frequency: 1,038.
- KSI: 139.
- EPDO: 29,809.
- EPDO per Collision: 28.7.

Vehicle Collisions:

- Frequency: 16,190.
- KSI: 1,150.
- EPDO: 309,126.
- EPDO per Collision: 19.1.

Using the EPDO score (which considers both frequency and severity of collisions) several heatmaps, segregated by the involved victim, i.e., pedestrian or bicycle, were created to help with identifying the most pedestrian and bicycle collision prone locations. These heatmaps are presented in the Safety Analysis Report. A visual inspection of the heatmaps was used to identify the corridors with the highest frequency and severity of collisions, both for collisions involving people walking and those involving people biking. These facilities were identified as high injury network (HIN) that warrant further investigation and improvements. The complete list of corridors and locations identified in the HIN are included in the Safety Analysis Report, however Table A-6 lists the top 10 locations for each victim category. Figure A-10 and Figure A-11 show the pedestrian and bicycle collisions heatmaps, respectively, in unincorporated Sacramento County. The color bands also show the HINs.

Table A-6: Collision Frequency and Severity by Type: (2015—2019)

There are two overarching categories: Pedestrian and Bicycle. These categories will be stated first, followed by the Locations that fall under them, and EPDO per Collision.

Pedestrian Collisions:

Roseville Road from Elkhorn Boulevard to Watt Ave.
121.5.

Power Inn Road from Florin Road to Lenhart Road.
103.8.

El Camino Avenue from Ethan Way to Watt Ave.
80.1.

Marconi Avenue from I-80 to Walnut Ave.
75.0.

Greenback Lane from Fair Oaks Boulevard to Main Ave.
74.6.

Intersection of Fair Oaks Boulevard and Watt Ave.
71.6.

Fruitridge Road from Franklin Boulevard to Stockton Boulevard.
67.0.

Watt Avenue from Q Street to Arden Way.
66.4.

Madison Avenue from Watt Avenue to Ruthland Drive.

66.2.

Arden Way from Ethan Way to Watt Ave.
63.9.

Bicycle Collisions:

Intersection of Elkhorn Boulevard and Sacramento Northern Bike Trail.
190.0.

47th Avenue from 27th Street to Stockton Boulevard.
38.5.

Elkhorn Boulevard from Watt Avenue to I-80.
36.3.

Watt Avenue from Elverta Road to Fair Oaks Boulevard.
30.9.

Power Inn Road from Florin Road to Calvine Road.
28.3.

Florin Road from Franklin Boulevard to Florin Perkins Road.
26.4.

Marconi Avenue from Bell Street to Fair Oaks Boulevard.
25.8.

Franklin Boulevard from 38th Avenue to Florin Road.
23.8.

Fair Oaks Boulevard from Kenneth Avenue to Auburn Boulevard.

23.7.

Dewey Drive from Coyle Avenue to Will Rogers Drive.
21.7.

Figure A-10. Pedestrian Collisions Heatmap.

A map shows the areas where Pedestrian Collisions have been recorded in Sacramento County. Collisions are weighted by EPDO, with five different classes of EPDO scores identified (The highest class being “High EPDO” and the lowest being “Low EPDO”). Pedestrian High Injury Corridors are shaded; and the borders of Sacramento County, Environmental Justice Communities, and Unincorporated Boundary are shown.

Factors Affecting Collisions:

Further analysis of the collision data highlighted two trends that warrant further study at specific locations and inclusion in the prioritization process. These included primary collision factors that were consistent across the county, and severity of collisions involving people biking on bicycle facilities. Additional details related to these conclusions as well as other trends studied can be found in the Safety Analysis Report.

CONTRIBUTING CRASH FACTORS:

One of the primary tools in diagnosing crash records to determine some level of connection to the built environment, environmental conditions, and human behavior is primary collision factor(s). Pedestrian violations (people walking failing to yield right of way to other vehicles while outside of a legal crosswalk) and pedestrian right-of-way

(driver failing to yield right of way to a pedestrian at a legal crosswalk) were the most frequent contributing factors for collisions involving someone walking in the study area. People failing to yield to vehicles outside of a legal crosswalk was by far the most frequent cause of collisions involving people walking regardless of the collision location, occurring more often than the next four primary causes combined in all scenarios and location types. In comparison, riding on the wrong side of the road (biking against the main direction of traffic) and improper turning (making an unsafe turning movement, or failure to signal) were found as the most frequent contributing factors to collisions involving someone biking. Riding on the wrong side of the road occurring more often than the next five primary causes combined at signalized intersections and the next three primary causes combined along segments. At unsignalized intersections, while riding on the wrong side of the road was still the most frequent primary cause, however improper turning and impinging on the automobile right of way also significantly contributed as primary collision factors.

It is also important to recognize that unsafe speed resulted in the highest average severity collisions involving people walking at intersections and the second highest average severity along segments. The same results were not replicated for collisions involving people riding bikes, with unsafe speed only having the highest average severity along segments and having lower occurrence at intersections.

Figure A-11. Bicycle Collisions Heatmap.

A map shows the areas where Bicycle Collisions have been recorded in Sacramento County. Similar to the Pedestrian Collisions Heatmap, Bicycle Collisions are weighted by EPDO, with five different classes of EPDO scores identified (The highest class being “High EPDO” and the lowest being “Low EPDO”). Pedestrian High Injury Corridors are shaded; and the borders of Sacramento County, Environmental Justice Communities, and Unincorporated Boundary are shown.

COLLISIONS ON BICYCLE FACILITIES:

When looking at the frequency and KSI of the collisions that occur on bicycle facilities (Table A-6), 93% of those collisions and 87% of KSI occur on Class 2 bike lanes, but collisions occurring on Class 1 or Class 3 facilities have a much higher average severity. Class 1 bike paths, which are completely separated from vehicle traffic, show the highest average severity. The collision locations on these facilities showed that these collisions happened where the bike path crosses the roadway, highlighting improved trail crossings as a specific need. Given these collisions being right-angle collisions and at higher speeds, they would tend to be more severe. Moreover, the average EPDO for collisions involving people biking on Class 2 bike Lane is almost half of the average EPDO for collisions involving people biking on bike routes. Studies have also shown that physically separated bikeways improve road safety for not only bicyclists, but all road users. This finding has been attributed to the fact that roadways with separated bikeways have lower vehicles speeds, which means, in the case of a collision, the resulting severity would be lower.

Level of Traffic Stress:

Figure A-12. Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress.

This map shows Levels of Traffic Stress for Pedestrian, divided into 4 classes: LTS 1 (Best), LTS 2, LTS 3, and LTS 4 (Worst). Other existing features that are labeled or outlined with a border are SacRT Stations, Amtrak Stations, Environmental Justice Communities, Railways, Water bodies, Parks, and Class 1 Multi-Use Paths.

Figure A-13. Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress.

This map shows Levels of Traffic Stress for Bicyclists, divided into 6 classes: 4-Fearless Adult, 3-Confident Adult, 2-Average Adult, 1-All

Ages and Abilities Residential, 1-All Ages and Abilities, and Residential Roadways. As for other existing features included on the map, the exact same set as in the previous figure is shown: SacRT Stations, Amtrak Stations, Environmental Justice Communities, Railways, Water bodies, Parks, and Class 1 Multi-Use Paths.

Figure A-14. Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress.

This map is very similar to Figure A-12, however it is zoomed out away from Environmental Justice Communities, to show the entire Sacramento County.

Figure A-15. Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress.

This map is very similar to Figure A-13, however it is zoomed out away from Environmental Justice Communities, to show the entire Sacramento County.

Appendix A-2: Safety Analysis Report:

Chapter cover shows the terminus of a road at a pedestrian crossing and four-way intersection, with bicycle detector pavement markings visible.

Introduction:

This report provides a summary of the collision trends involving people walking and biking and high-risk locations within unincorporated Sacramento County. The analysis includes collision data trends analysis in the study area, spatial analysis of the collisions involving people walking or biking, and the identification of roadways and intersections showing a safety need associated with pedestrians and bicycles, better known as High Injury Network (HIN). The analysis presented in this study used the collision data through the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS). The purpose of this memorandum is to define the baseline safety conditions to identify trends and patterns found in both locations and types of collisions. This will be used to develop counter - measures and projects that will address deficiencies and improve safety for multimodal travel.

Summary of Historic Trends and Identified Deficiencies:

The key trends and deficiencies identified from the analysis summarized in this document provide a direction of programs and improvements to consider as part of this Plan. A summary of these trends and deficiencies for collisions involving people walking and biking are as follows:

• Pedestrians are shown to be the most vulnerable users, with similar frequency of crashes to those involving people bicycling, but much higher crash severities.

• The proportion of collisions involving people walking and biking happen ten times more frequently than the proportion of people commuting by walking or biking.

• Three times as many collisions occur at intersections, however collisions occurring along segments are more severe both for people walking and biking.

• Within school zones, collisions involving people walking and biking result in less severe injuries, even more so for collisions involving school-age children.

• While very rare, the highest severity collisions involving people biking on a bicycle facility is at Class 1 roadway crossings that lack protective improvements such as RRFB/HAWK signals.

Data Collection and Methodology:

OVERVIEW OF COLLISION DATA:

The raw collision data was retrieved from the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) for the most recent five-year time period available (1/1/2015-12/31/2019). The dataset includes a multitude of information for each collision, including date, time, location, traffic control, weather, severity, primary collision factor, lighting, and CHP notes. While TIMS provides the data for injury and fatality collisions (Property Damage Only – or PDO collisions are not addressed in TIMS), a review of collisions involving people walking or biking shows that the majority of them are no-PDO, hence TIMS database can be used instead of the Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS), which incorporates PDO collisions. Notably, our investigation of the collisions involving people walking or biking in Sacramento showed that less than 1% of collisions involving people walking or biking are PDO. Given that, TIMS data was found to be sufficient for this level of analysis. All collisions were classified as intersection or segment collisions based on the distance to the nearest intersection. According to the California Local Road Safety Manual (LRSM) and the influence area of the intersections, collisions within 250 feet of an intersection were considered intersection collisions, and all collisions farther than 250 feet from an intersection were considered segment collisions.

ANALYSIS APPROACH:

There are many methods of analyzing crash records to identify systemic trends and patterns as well as priority locations in need of improvements. One important metric to consider is which locations have the highest number of collisions occur, especially the ones that result in in the victim being killed or severely injured (KSI). However, it is also important to look for systemic trends that may reveal physical, environmental, or behavioral characteristics that can lead to insights about where broader ranging policies or programs can be applied to reduce crash occurrences or severity. This analysis reports on both the total number of collisions and KSI as well as making use of the Equivalent Property Damage Only (EPDO) (Footnote 21) method which provides an average severity score across different categories, allowing for direct comparison of collision types without comprehensive traffic volume data. The severity score is based on aggregating an EPDO factor that represents the societal and economic cost of different crash severities (Footnote 22) with values shown in Table A-7 These cost estimates include the monetary losses associated with medical care, emergency services, property damage, lost productivity, and the like, to society as a whole. When summarized across locations (hotspots), collision type, driver behavior, or roadway characteristics, time of day, or environmental conditions can help compare and contrast trends and identify high priority collision characteristics. It should be noted that the EPDO score for collisions involving people walking and biking were determined by the level of injury sustained by the pedestrian or bicyclist. For the other collisions, the EPDO was determined by the highest level of injury sustained by the involved vehicles' occupants.

Footnote 21: 2010 Highway Safety Manual. (HSM)

Footnote 22: Caltrans Local Roadway Safety Manual, Appendix D, April 2020.

Table A-7: EPDO Weighting Factor by Collision Severity:

Collision Severity will be listed first, followed by any subcategories, and finally the EPDO Factor will be stated.

Fatal and Severe Injury:

- Signalized Intersection – 120.
- Non-Signalized Intersection – 190.
- Roadway – 165.

Injury (Other Visible) – 11.

Injury (Complaint of Pain) – 6.

Property Damage Only (PDO) – 1.

For this project and most other safety analyses, the collision severity is defined in the HSM as follows:

• Fatal injury: A collision that results in the death of a person within 30 days of the collision.

• Severe (incapacitating) injury: A collision that results in broken bones, dislocation, severe lacerations, or unconsciousness, but not death.

• Other visible (non-incapacitating) injury: A collision that results in other visible injuries, including minor lacerations, bruising, and rashes.

• Possible injury (complaint of pain): A collision that results in the complaint of non-visible pain/injury, such as confusion, limping, and soreness.

• Property damage only (PDO): A collision without injury or complaint of pain but resulting in property damage to a vehicle or other object, commonly referred to as a “fender bender.”

• PDO collisions do not include mechanical issues, such as a flat tire unless the failure results in a collision with another vehicle or object.

For each category of crash descriptors, a summary is provided that includes five-year total of crashes (frequency), KSI, total EPDO, and average EPDO by collision. This approach identified collision patterns for each mode (pedestrian and bicycle) compared to crashes involving all vehicles, resulting in a list of priority locations with a history of those collision types. The list of priority locations was further supplemented through hotspot analysis, which identified intersections and corridors with high KSI and/or EPDO scores (high frequency and/or severity of collisions) and EPDO per collision (high average severity across collisions). The following sections summarize the key findings of the safety analysis as well as high-risk network or HINs.

Overview of Countywide Injury Collision Trends:

This section summarizes the injury collision trends and patterns in unincorporated Sacramento County and, specifically focusing on collisions involving people walking and biking. In total, 2,038 collisions involving injury to someone walking or biking occurred in unincorporated Sacramento County between January 1, 2015, and December 31, 2019. Of these collisions, 1,000 involved a vehicle colliding with someone walking (Footnote 23), 1,038 involved a collision between a vehicle and someone biking. A summary of the frequency and relative severity of these collisions is presented in Table A-8. As can be seen in this table, while the number collisions involving people walking or biking over the five-year period are similar, the resulting EPDO (or average severity) of a collision involving someone walking is more than twice as severe than a collision involving someone biking, and more than three times as severe as compared to the average severity across all injury crashes.

A review of the 2018 Five-Year American Community Survey (ACS) shows that a large majority (88.7%) of unincorporated Sacramento County residents commute by driving, either alone or in a carpool, while only 1.7% commute by transit, 0.9% commute by walking, and 0.4% commute by biking. Looking deeper at the collisions by only assessing severe injury and fatal collisions, 1,637 severe injury and fatal collisions happened during this period, out of which 487 involved either a pedestrian or a bicyclist. That is, while approximately one out of every nine injury collisions involve someone walking or riding a bike, the proportion increases to almost one out of every three for severe injury and fatal collisions. This disproportionate share, as shown in Figure A-16, illustrates the vulnerability of pedestrians and bicyclists compared to other road users, which, in turn, necessitates proper investigation of collisions involving people walking or biking and countermeasure development.

Footnote 23: One collision occurred between someone walking and someone biking. Given that the person walking was more severely injured than the person biking, it was categorized with the other collisions involving people walking.

Table A-8: Injury Collision Frequency and EPDO by Type: (2015—2019)

Collision Type will be listed first; other column headings will be stated below.

Pedestrian Collisions:

- Frequency: 1,000.
- KSI: 348.
- EPDO: 60,852.
- EPDO per Collision: 60.9.

Bicycle Collisions:

- Frequency: 1,038.
- KSI: 139.
- EPDO: 29,809.

- EPDO per Collision: 28.7.

Vehicle Collisions:

- Frequency: 16,190.
- KSI: 1,150.
- EPDO: 309,126.
- EPDO per Collision: 19.1.

Figure A-16. Comparison of Commute Mode Split to Proportion of Injury Crashes:

Three pie charts show the comparisons between the make-up of commuters on the road, or the mode split; the percent make-up of injury crashes that occur to each type of commuter; and the percent make-up of each type of commuter killed or severely injured.

In the chart titled Mode Split, it is shown that vehicles make up a majority of the road, at 98.7%. Those walking make up 0.9%, while those on bikes are the remaining 0.4%.

In the chart titled Injury Crashes, it is shown that vehicles are involved in 88.8% of the crashes, those walking make up 5.5%, and bicyclists are in 5.7% of the crashes.

In the chart titled Killed or Severely Injured, vehicles are involved in 70.3% of the cases, walking pedestrians are in 21.3% of the cases, while those on bikes make up the remaining 8.5% of those affected.

COLLISION LOCATION:

Further analysis was conducted to investigate the effect of collision location, i.e., segment versus intersection, on the frequency and severity of collisions involving people walking or biking, as represented by the average EPDO score. Table A-9 presents the collision frequency, EPDO scores, and average EPDO score per collision for each collision type and location for unincorporated Sacramento County. The results reveal several important trends and possible causes:

• Far more collisions involving people walking or biking (approximately 3 times as many) occur at intersections as compared to segments. This is likely due to the increased number of potential conflict points where vehicles and people walking or biking can interact.

• While many more collisions occur at intersections, the severity of injuries incurred along segments is slightly higher, potentially due to increased vehicle speed.

• Based on the average severity (EPDO), collisions involving people walking have twice the severity level as collisions involving people biking and more than three times the average severity level over all crashes.

• Despite the commute mode share for walking (0.9%) being more than twice of that for bicycling (0.4%), the frequency of crashes between the two are very similar. This could have two potential causes or a combination: being that bicycle trips are often longer, leading to more exposure, as well as bicycle are more often operating within the same right-of-way as cars.

Table A-9: EPDO Scores for Intersections And Segments:

There are two subcategories under each collision type—Segment and Intersection. The collision type will be listed first, followed by these subcategories. Other column headings will be stated.

Pedestrian Collisions:

- Segment:
    Frequency: 262.
    KSI: 107.
    EPDO: 18,990.
    EPDO per COL: 72.5.
- Intersection:
    Frequency: 738.
    KSI: 241.
    EPDO: 41,862.
    EPDO per COL: 56.7.

Bicycle Collisions:

- Segment:
    Frequency: 253.
    KSI: 38.
    EPDO: 8,085.
    EPDO per COL: 23.0.
- Intersection:
    Frequency: 785.
    KSI: 101.
    EPDO: 21,724.
    EPDO per COL: 27.7.

Vehicle Collisions:

- Segment:
    Frequency: 6,453.
    KSI: 542.
    EPDO: 142,833.

EPDO per COL: 22.1.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 9,727.

  KSI: 608.

  EPDO: 166,292.

  EPDO per COL: 17.1.

CONTRIBUTING FACTORS PER LOCATION:

One of the primary tools in diagnosing crash records to determine some level of connection to the built environment, environmental conditions, and human behavior is primary collision factor(s), which is recorded by the reporting officer. It is however important to recognize that this is not a description of blame or fault, which is specifically not included in crash records. Figure A-17 and Figure A-18 show the location, contributing factors, and associated average EPDO scores of the studied collisions involving people walking or biking, respectively, in unincorporated Sacramento County. Pedestrian violations (people walking failing to yield right of way to other vehicles while outside of a legal crosswalk) and pedestrian right-of-way (driver failing to yield right of way to a pedestrian at a legal crosswalk) were the most frequent contributing factors for collisions involving someone walking in the study area. People failing to yield to vehicles outside of a legal crosswalk was by far the most frequent cause of collisions involving people walking regardless of the collision location, occurring more often than the next four primary causes combined in all scenarios and location types. In comparison, riding on the wrong side of the road (biking against the main direction of traffic) and improper turning (making an unsafe turning movement, or failure to signal) were found as the most frequent contributing factors to collisions involving someone biking. Riding on the wrong side of the road occurring more often than the next five primary causes combined at signalized intersections and the next three primary causes combined along segments. At unsignalized intersections, while riding on the wrong side of the road was still the most frequent primary cause, however improper turning and impinging on the

automobile right of way also significantly contributed as primary collision factors. Given the large proportion of crashes associated with pedestrian violations and biking against traffic, later chapters will explore how this trend might be addressed systemically with educational and outreach programs in combination with physical infrastructure that provides safer alternatives. It is also important to recognize that unsafe speed resulted in the highest average severity collisions involving people walking at intersections and the second highest average severity along segments. The same results were not replicated for collisions involving people riding bikes, with unsafe speed only having the highest average severity along segments and having lower occurrence at intersections.

Figure A-17. Collision Location and Contributing Factor - Pedestrian Collisions.

A flow chart shows Pedestrian Collision trends in Unincorporated Sacramento County.

Figure A-18. Collision Location and Contributing Factor - Bicycle Collisions.

A flow chart shows Bicycle Collision trends in Unincorporated Sacramento County.

TIME OF DAY AND LIGHTING:

Table A-10 summarizes the pedestrian and bicycle EPDO scores for the time of day and lighting conditions in unincorporated Sacramento County. This table shows that the average EPDO score for collisions involving people walking is significantly higher at night (more than doubled compared with the average EPDO score during daylight condition). A similar observation is made for the collisions including people biking, while the average EPDO score is less pronounced. For the sake of comparison, the average EPDO (severity) for injury collisions in unincorporated Sacramento County are also provided in this table. Based on these figures, the average EPDO scores for vehicle

collisions is less variable for different lighting conditions (i.e., 16.2 to 33.1) while a strong variability of average EPDO scores for collisions involving people walking or biking as a function of lighting is noticeable (i.e., 25.6 to 52.5 for collisions including people biking and 35.3 to 91.2 for collisions including people walking). The possible explanation for this finding is that during these periods, traffic on roadways is lower than other time intervals during the day. The lower volumes can lead to riskier behavior (e.g., crossing at non-crosswalk locations, riding in the middle of the roadway) while darker conditions and higher speeds can reduce visibility for drivers, increasing the likelihood of severe injuries during darkness.

Table A-10: EPDO Scores by Time of Day/ Lighting:

Each Collision Type will be listed, followed by the other column headings in bullets, and sub-column headings directly after.

Pedestrian Collisions:

- Segment:

  Frequency: 145.

  KSI: 77.

  EPDO per COL: 91.2.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 351.

  KSI: 181.

  EPDO per COL: 83.3.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 471.

KSI: 82.

EPDO per COL: 35.3.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 31.

  KSI: 8.

  EPDO per COL: 47.4.

Bicycle Collisions:

- Segment:

  Frequency: 61.

  KSI: 16.

  EPDO per COL: 52.5.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 195.

  KSI: 33.

  EPDO per COL: 31.9.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 747.

  KSI: 84.

  EPDO per COL: 25.6.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 34.

KSI: 6.

EPDO per COL: 35.7.

Vehicle Collisions:

- Segment:

  Frequency: 1,359.

  KSI: 199.

  EPDO per COL: 33.1.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 3,221.

  KSI: 301.

  EPDO per COL: 22.6.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 11,089.

  KSI: 608.

  EPDO per COL: 16.2.

- Intersection:

  Frequency: 491.

  KSI: 42.

  EPDO per COL: 21.8.

WEATHER CONDITIONS:

Based on the collision analysis shown in Table A-11, the majority of collisions involving people walking or biking happened during clear/cloudy weather conditions. As can be seen in this table, the average EPDO score per pedestrian and bicycle collision is slightly higher during precipitation times compared with clear/cloudy weather conditions while for vehicles this trend is reversed.

However, the difference is not significant enough to highlight the role of weather on increased pedestrian and bicycle injury severity. Although, this slight increase in average EPDO score can be attributed to several factors such as reduced visibility of drivers, slick streets, and tendency towards mid-block crossing (pedestrian violation). Moreover, people are less likely to walk and bike during the rain, hence the lower numbers of collisions. However, those who walk/bike in the rain are likely the most vulnerable people who do not have any other alternative transportation option. Given this observation, weather conditions were not found to be a significant contributing factor to collisions involving people walking or biking and not investigated further.

Table A-11: EPDO Scores by Weather:

Collision Type will be listed first, followed by the weather subcategory, and then finally the data.

Pedestrian Collisions:

- Clear/Cloudy:

    Frequency: 979.

    KSI: 339.

    EPDO: 59,430.

    EPDO per COL: 60.7.

- Precipitation:

Frequency: 21.

KSI: 9.

EPDO: 1,422.

EPDO per COL: 67.7.

Bicycle Collisions:

- Clear/Cloudy:

  Frequency: 1,026.

  KSI: 137.

  EPDO: 29,439.

  EPDO per COL: 28.7.

- Precipitation:

  Frequency: 12.

  KSI: 2.

  EPDO: 370.

  EPDO per COL: 30.8.

Vehicle Collisions:

- Clear/Cloudy:

  Frequency: 15,664.

  KSI: 1,125.

  EPDO: 301,080.

  EPDO per COL: 22.9.

- Precipitation:

    Frequency: 464.

    KSI: 18.

    EPDO: 6,502.

    EPDO per COL: 14.0.

Table A-12: EPDO Scores – Pedestrian and Bicycle Collisions within School Zones:

Pedestrian Collisions:

- Total:

    Frequency: 1,000.

    KSI: 348.
    EPDO: 60,852.

    EPDO per Collision: 60.9.

- Within School Zone: (All)

    Frequency: 373.

    KSI: 112.
    EPDO: 20,416.

    EPDO per Collision: 54.7.

- Within School Zone: (Under 18)

    Frequency: 116.

    KSI: 21.
    EPDO: 4,080.

    EPDO per Collision: 35.2.

Bicycle Collisions:

- Total:

  Frequency: 1,038.

  KSI: 139.
  EPDO: 29,809.

  EPDO per Collision: 28.7.

- Within School Zone: (All)

  Frequency: 372.

  KSI: 52.
  EPDO: 11,050.

  EPDO per Collision: 29.7.

- Within School Zone: (Under 18)

  Frequency: 111.

  KSI: 6.
  EPDO: 2,030.

  EPDO per Collision: 18.3.

PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE COLLISIONS WITHIN SCHOOL ZONES:

School zones are known destinations for pedestrians and bicyclists, specifically those aged 18 and younger. For this study, and based on the legal definition, a school zone is an area within almost a quarter-mile of the school property. The locations of all schools in the unincorporated Sacramento County were obtained and a buffer of a quarter-mile was plotted around the schools and all the collisions involving people walking or biking

falling in those buffers were identified. Table A-12 summarizes the finding of this analysis. When comparing severity by age group for collisions involving people walking or biking within school zones, children walking and biking within school zones saw lower severity injuries on average. A review of the crash times reveals that the majority of collisions involving school age children walking or biking happen during the periods of 7-9 am and 3-5 pm, when children are arriving at or leaving the schools, respectively. This may be a result of increased congestion from drop-off/pick-up, or increased vigilance due to changed signage and striping within school zones. However, collisions involving adults walking and biking are more prevalent and spread throughout the afternoon.

SCHOOLS WITH HIGHER SEVERITY COLLISIONS:

Following the analysis in the previous section, all the schools in the unincorporated Sacramento County were further investigated based on the number of collisions involving school aged people walking or biking as well as the average EPDO per collision. Table A-13 summarizes the collision statistics for the 10 schools with the highest collision frequency and severity. A complete list of the schools is provided in Appendix A-3 and Appendix A-4.

Table A-13: Schools with the Highest Severity Crashes:

Schools marked with an asterisk or star are grouped in one location.

David Reese Elementary:

Frequency: 5.

EPDO: 408.

EPDO per Collision: 81.6.

James Rutter Middle:

Frequency: 5.

EPDO: 408.

EPDO per Collision: 81.6.

Del Campo High*:

Frequency: 9.

EPDO: 437.

EPDO per Collision: 48.6.

Will Rogers Middle*:

Frequency: 9.

EPDO: 437.

EPDO per Collision: 48.6.

Thomas Kelly Elementary*:

Frequency: 11.

EPDO: 454.

EPDO per Collision: 41.3.

Harry Dewey Fundamental Elementary:

Frequency: 12.

EPDO: 460.

EPDO per Collision: 38.3.

Sheldon High:

Frequency: 15.

EPDO: 333.

EPDO per Collision: 22.2.

T.R. Smedberg Middle:

Frequency: 15.

EPDO: 333.

EPDO per Collision: 22.2.

Highlands High:

Frequency: 13.

EPDO: 108.

EPDO per Collision: 8.3.

Hillsdale Elementary:

Frequency: 13.

EPDO: 108.

EPDO per Collision: 8.3.

BICYCLE COLLISIONS ON BICYCLE FACILITIES:

To assess the frequency and severity of collisions involving people biking on roadways with and without any bicycle infrastructures, the bicycle facility map of the unincorporated Sacramento County was obtained. Frequency and EPDO scores of all the collisions involving people biking on these facilities were calculated. The summary of this analysis is presented in Table A-14. As can be seen in this table, just as many collisions involving people biking occur on bicycle facilities as occur otherwise, and with similar average severity. This means, on average, the presence of bicycle facilities does not reduce the bicycle collision severity. However, when looking at the frequency and KSI of the collisions the occur on bicycle facilities, 93% of those collisions and 87% of KSI occur on Class 2 bike lanes, but collisions occurring on Class 1 or Class 3 facilities have a much higher average severity. According to Table A-14, collisions on Class 1 bike paths, which are completely separated from vehicle traffic, were very rare but show the highest average severity when they occur where the bike path crosses the roadway. Given these collisions being right-angle collisions and at higher speeds, they would tend to be more severe, which highlights improved trail crossings as a specific need. Moreover, the average EPDO for collisions involving people biking on Class 2 bike Lane is almost half of the average EPDO for collisions involving people biking on bike routes. Studies have also shown that physically separated bikeways improve road safety for not

only bicyclists, but all road users. This finding has been attributed to the fact that roadways with separated bikeways have lower vehicles speeds, which means, in the case of a collision, the resulting severity would be lower.

Table A-14: EPDO Scores – Bicycle Collisions and Bicycle Infrastructure:

Total Bicycle Collisions:

Frequency: 1,038.

KSI: 139.

EPDO: 29,809.

EPDO per Collision: 28.7.

Bicycle Collisions on All Bicycle Facilities:

- Class 1 – Bike Path:

  Frequency: 3.

  KSI: 2.

  EPDO: 386.

  EPDO per Collision: 128.7.

- Class 2 – Bike Lane:

  Frequency: 447.

  KSI: 54.

  EPDO: 11,818.

  EPDO per Collision: 26.4.

- Class 3 – Bike Route:

  Frequency: 26.

  KSI: 6.

  EPDO: 1,300.

  EPDO per Collision: 50.0.

Bicycle Collisions not on a Bicycle Facility:

Frequency: 562.

KSI: 77.

EPDO: 16,305.

EPDO per Collision: 29.0.

Collision Trends at Environmental Justice Areas:

A review of crash types, frequency, and severity of collisions in the Environmental Justice (EJ) areas was performed to ensure that sufficient investment was directed towards improving any safety deficiencies of those areas proportional to need. Overall, the North Vineyard area had a very low occurrence of collisions involving people walking or biking, due to low density and geography of the area. The other three areas all had comparable collision frequency and severity for collisions involving people walking and biking. The Environmental Justice Element also provides a comparison of Bike and Pedestrian collision rates per 1,000 residents (Footnote 24), showing that Non-EJ areas have the lowest collision rate with North Vineyard having a collision rate only slightly higher. South Sacramento however has a rate almost twice as high as non-EJ areas and North Highlands and West Arden-Arcade both have a rate more than twice that of non-EJ areas.

Footnote 24: Sacramento County Environmental Justice Element (2019), Figure 11.

NORTH HIGHLANDS/FOOTHILL FARMS:

Figure A-19 and Figure A-20 show the location, contributing factors, and associated EPDO scores of recent collisions involving people walking or biking, respectively, in the North Highlands/Foothill Farms EJ area. Pedestrian violations and right-of-way, as well as unsafe speed, were the most frequent contributing factors to pedestrian collisions in this EJ, regardless of the collision location. In contrast, biking on the wrong side of the road as well as improper turning were found as the most frequent contributing factor to collisions involving people biking.

NORTH VINEYARD:

Figure A-21 and Figure A-22 show the location, contributing factors, and associated EPDO scores of recent collisions involving people walking or biking, respectively, in the North Vineyard EJ area. The number of collisions involving people walking or biking in this EJ is not significant to help us draw a rigorous conclusion. However, pedestrian violations and unsafe speed were found to contribute to pedestrian collisions while improper turning was the most prevalent contributing factor to collisions involving people biking.

SOUTH SACRAMENTO:

Figure A-18 and Figure A-19 show the location, contributing factors, and associated EPDO scores of recent collisions involving people walking or biking, respectively, in the South Sacramento EJ area. Pedestrian violations and right-of-way, as well as unsafe speed, were the most frequent contributing factors to pedestrian collisions in this EJ, regardless of the collision location. In contrast, traffic signals and signs, improper turning, and automobile right-of-way were found as the most frequent contributing factors to bicycle-involved collisions.

WEST ARDEN-ARCADE:

Figure A-25 and Figure A-26 show the location, contributing factors, and associated EPDO scores of recent collisions involving people walking or biking, respectively, in the West Arden-Arcade EJ area. Pedestrian violations and right-of-way were the most frequent contributing factors to pedestrian collisions in this EJ, regardless of the collision location. In contrast, bicycling on the wrong side of the road, improper turning, and automobile right-of-way were found as the most frequent contributing factors to bicycle-involved collisions.

The following figures—From A-19 to A-26—are a series of flow charts that go over trends on the topics stated in their figure titles, specifically on Collision Locations and Contributing Factors by Frequency and EPDO Scores. These titles are as follows:

Figure A-19. Pedestrian Collisions in North Highlands/Foothill Farms.

Figure A-20. Bicycle Collisions in North Highlands/Foothill Farms.

Figure A-21. Pedestrian Collisions in North Vineyard.

Figure A-22. Bicycle Collisions in North Vineyard.

Figure A-23. Pedestrian Collisions in South Sacramento.

Figure A-24. Bicycle Collisions in South Sacramento.

Figure A-25. Pedestrian Collisions in West Arden-Arcade.

Figure A-26. Bicycle Collisions in West Arden-Arcade.

High Injury Network Identification:

Using the EPDO score (which considers both frequency and severity of collisions) several heatmaps, segregated by the involved victim, i.e., pedestrian or bicycle, were created to help with identifying the HIN. These heatmaps are presented in Figure A-27 through Figure A-36. Color bands in these figures show the identified HINs. According to the analysis and the heatmaps, several facilities, as summarized in Table A-15 and Table A-16 for collisions involving people walking or biking HINs, respectively, were identified to warrant further investigation and improvements.

Figure A-27 to Figure A-31. Pedestrian Collisions Heatmap - Section 1 to Section 5.

In these maps, Collisions are weighted by EPDO, and are broken up into 5 classes; from High EPDO to Low EPDO. The Sacramento County border is outlined, as well as the Environmental Justice Communities. Areas that are considered Pedestrian High Injury Corridors are highlighted.

Figure A-32 to Figure A-36. Bicycle Collisions Heatmap - Section 1 to Section 5.

These maps are similar to the previous set of Figures, in that Collisions are weighted by EPDO, and are broken up into 5 classes; from High EPDO to Low EPDO. The Sacramento County border is outlined, as well as the Environmental Justice Communities. Areas that are considered Bicycle High Injury Corridors are highlighted.

The following tables summarize the number and contributing factors for identified high injury segments. The provided information for each segment includes the length of the roadway, a breakdown of how many crashes involving people walking and biking occurred at intersections with and without striped pedestrian crossings and at midblock locations, and then the top three contributing factors for each segment as found in the associated crash records.

Table A-15: Pedestrian Collisions High Injury Network:

Notes on this table:

- H I N ID or, HIN ID: High Injury Network ID.
- EXTENTS: The extents of the facility or intersection name.
- LENGTH: Length of the facility in miles.
- INTERSECTION: Number of intersections.
- INTERSECTION WITH PED CROSSING: Number of intersections with pedestrian crosswalk.
- MID-BLOCK CROSSING: Number of mid-block crossings.
- COLLISION FACTOR WITH NUMBER: Contributing factor along with the associated average EPDO per collisions in parentheses

HIN ID will be listed first, followed by the rest of the data. Column headings will be stated for each.

HIN ID: 1.

Extents: Watt Avenue from Q Street to Arden Way.

Length: 7 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 68.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 29.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 4.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Speed (144)

2.) Driving or Bicycling Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drug (100.5)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (83.7)

HIN ID: 2.

Extents: Madison Avenue from Watt Avenue to Ruthland Drive.

Length: 3.3 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 19.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 16.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (120)

2.) Other Hazardous Violation (120)

3.) Unsafe Speed (109)

HIN ID: 3.

Extents: Marconi Avenue from I-80 to Walnut Avenue.

Length: 4 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 41.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 11.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Improper Turning (190)

2.) Traffic Signals and Signs (120)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (90)

HIN ID: 4.

Extents: El Camino Avenue from Ethan Way to Watt Avenue.

Length: 2 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 29.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 7.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Right of Way (98)

2.) Pedestrian Violation (90.5)

3.) Improper Turning (6)

HIN ID: 5.

Extents: Arden Way from Ethan Way to Watt Avenue.

Length: 2 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 17.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 8.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Speed (190)

2.) Driving or Bicycling Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drug (155)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (101.5)

HIN ID: 6.

Extents: Howe Avenue from Auburn Boulevard to Sierra Boulevard.

Length: 2.3 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 17.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 12.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Violation (72.4)

2.) Automobile Right of Way (63)

3.) Pedestrian Right of Way (6.8)

HIN ID: 7.

Extents: Fair Oaks Boulevard from Auburn Boulevard to Oak Avenue.

Length: 4.7 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 32.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 13.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Violation (73.4)

2.) Driving or Bicycling Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drug (65.5)

3.) Improper Turning (46.5)

HIN ID: 8.

Extents: Florin Road from Franklin Boulevard to Florin Perkins Road.

Length: 3.8 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 17.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 11.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Violation (86.9)

2.) Unsafe Speed (75.5)

3.) Improper Turning (37)

HIN ID: 9.

Extents: Stockton Boulevard from Riza Avenue to East Stockton Boulevard/SR-99.

Length: 2.9 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 22.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 10.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Speed (190)

2.) Other Than Driver (or Pedestrian) (165)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (60.8)

HIN ID: 10.

Extents: Power Inn Road from Florin Road to Lenhart Road.

Length: 2 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 13.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 5.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Driving or Bicycling Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drug (120)

2.) Other Than Driver (or Pedestrian) (120)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (113.7)

HIN ID: 11.

Extents: 47th Avenue from Franklin Boulevard to Stockton Boulevard.

Length: 1.9 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 14.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 5.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: (Left blank)

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Violation (80.1)

2.) Traffic Signals and Signs (11)

3.) Improper Turning (11)

HIN ID: 12.

Extents: Fruitridge Road from Franklin Boulevard to Stockton Boulevard.

Length: 1.6 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 16.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 6.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 1.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (120)

2.) Pedestrian Violation (88.8)

3.) Unsafe Speed (65.5)

HIN ID: 13.

Extents: Intersection of Fair Oaks Boulevard and Watt Avenue.

Length: N/A.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 1.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 1.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: N/A.

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Violation (48.3)

HIN ID: 14.

Extents: Intersection of Elkhorn Boulevard and Walerga Road.

Length: N/A.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 1.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 1.

- At Mid-Block Crossing: N/A.

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Violation (61.6)

HIN ID: 15.

Extents: Fulton Avenue from I-80 to Northrop Avenue.

Length: 3.5 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 24.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 8.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Automobile Right of Way (190)

2.) Pedestrian Violation (67.9)

3.) Pedestrian Right of Way (16.7)

HIN ID: 16.

Extents: Roseville Road from Elkhorn Boulevard to Watt Avenue.

Length: 2.9 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 4.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 2.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Improper Turning (165)

2.) Unsafe Speed (145.3)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (143.4)

HIN ID: 17.

Extents: Greenback Lane from Fair Oaks Boulevard to Main Avenue.

Length: 3.3 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 17.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 10.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Speed (120)

2.) Other Hazardous Violation (120)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (96.6)

HIN ID: 18.

Extents: Hazel Avenue from Oak Avenue to Phoenix Avenue.

Length: 2.8 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 20.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 6.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Speed (190)

2.) Unsafe Lane Change (165)

3.) Pedestrian Violation (54.5)

HIN ID: 19.

Extents: Sunrise Boulevard from Madison Avenue to Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Length: 1.7 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 10.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 5.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 0.

Factors:

1.) Pedestrian Violation (107)

2.) Improper Turning (8.5)

3.) Pedestrian Right of Way (6.8)

HIN ID: 20.

Extents: Dewey Drive from Coyle Avenue to Will Rogers Drive.

Length: 1.1 miles.

Collisions:

- At intersections: 16.
- At intersections with Ped Crossing: 3.
- At Mid-Block Crossing: 1.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Starting or Backing (98)

2.) Pedestrian Violation (66.3)

3.) Driving or Bicycling Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drug (11)

Table A-16: Bicycle Collisions High Injury Network:

Notes on this table:

- H I N ID or, HIN ID: High Injury Network ID.
- EXTENTS: The extents of the facility or intersection name.
- LENGTH: Length of the facility in miles.
- CLASS 2 LENGTH (in MILES): Length of the Class 2 bike facility in miles.
- CLASS 3 LENGTH (in MILES): Length of the Class 3 bike facility in miles.
- INTERSECTION: Number of intersections.
- COLLISION FACTOR WITH NUMBER: Contributing factor along with the associated average EPDO per collisions in parentheses.

HIN ID will be listed first, followed by the rest of the data. Column headings will be stated for each.

HIN ID: 1.

Extents: Watt Avenue from Elverta Road to Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Length: 10 miles.

Class 2 Length: 13.8 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 91.

Factors:

1.) Driving or Bicycling Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drug (165)

2.) Unsafe Lane Change (63)

3.) Traffic Signals and Signs (62.3)

HIN ID: 2.

Extents: Marconi Avenue from Bell Street to Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Length: 4.6 miles.

Class 2 Length: 4.2 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.5 miles.

Intersection: 17.

Factors:

1.) Automobile Right of Way (80.6)

2.) Traffic Signals and Signs (29.8)

3.) Wrong Side of Road (23.5)

HIN ID: 3.

Extents: Fair Oaks Boulevard from Kenneth Avenue to Auburn Boulevard.

Length: 4.4 miles.

Class 2 Length: 4.5 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 36.

Factors:

1.) Wrong Side of Road (30.8)

2.) Other Hazardous Violation (11)

3.) Traffic Signals and Signs (9)

HIN ID: 4.

Extents: Madison Avenue from Watt Avenue to Ruthland Drive.

Length: 3.5 miles.

Class 2 Length: 3.9 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.5 miles.

Intersection: 19.

Factors:

1.) Improper Turning (53.6)

2.) Wrong Side of Road (12.4)

3.) Unsafe Lane Change (11)

HIN ID: 5.

Extents: Intersection of Elkhorn Boulevard and Sacramento Northern Bike Trail.

Length: N/A.

Class 2 Length: 0.8 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 1.

Factors:

1.) Automobile Right of Way (190)

2.) Automobile Right of Way (190)

HIN ID: 6.

Extents: Howe Avenue from Edison Avenue to Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Length: 2.6 miles.

Class 2 Length: 1.9 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 19.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (54.5)

2.) Automobile Right of Way (48.3)

3.) Other Hazardous Violation (11)

HIN ID: 7.

Extents: Franklin Boulevard from 38th Avenue to Florin Road.

Length: 1.8 miles.

Class 2 Length: 3.0 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 16.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (75.4)

2.) Unsafe Speed (11)

3.) Unsafe Speed (11)

HIN ID: 8.

Extents: Florin Road from Franklin Boulevard to Florin Perkins Road.

Length: 4.1 miles.

Class 2 Length: 6.0 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 17.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (59.4)

2.) Automobile Right of Way (45.7)

3.) Improper Turning (37.6)

HIN ID: 9.

Extents: Stockton Boulevard from Fruitridge Road to Victory Avenue.

Length: 4.1 miles.

Class 2 Length: 4.5 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.7 miles.

Intersection: 33.

Factors:

1.) Improper Turning (36.2)

2.) Traffic Signals and Signs (35.8)

3.) Unsafe Speed (11)

HIN ID: 10.

Extents: Power Inn Road from Florin Road to Calvine Road.

Length: 2.9 miles.

Class 2 Length: 6.4 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 20.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (120)

2.) Other Hazardous Violation (100.5)

3.) Improper Turning (27.5)

HIN ID: 11.

Extents: Elk Grove Florin Road from Florin Road to Calvine Road.

Length: 3.2 miles.

Class 2 Length: 6.3 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 18.

Factors:

1.) Other Hazardous Violation (44)

2.) Wrong Side of Road (20.2)

3.) Improper Turning (11)

HIN ID: 12.

Extents: 47th Avenue from 27th Street to Stockton Boulevard.

Length: 2.3 miles.

Class 2 Length: 1.9 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 16.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Lane Change (190)

2.) Traffic Signals and Signs (44)

3.) Wrong Side of Road (39.8)

HIN ID: 13.

Extents: Walerga Road from North Loop Boulevard to Elkhorn Boulevard.

Length: 2.2 miles.

Class 2 Length: 5.9 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 9.

Factors:

1.) Unsafe Lane Change (65.5)

2.) Wrong Side of Road (19.1)

3.) Improper Turning (11)

HIN ID: 14.

Extents: Elkhorn Boulevard from Watt Avenue to I-80.

Length: 3.2 miles.

Class 2 Length: 7.9 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 19.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (82)

2.) Improper Turning (55.7)

3.) Wrong Side of Road (31.9)

HIN ID: 15.

Extents: Howe Avenue from Edison Avenue to Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Length: 4 miles.

Class 2 Length: 8.0 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 18.

Factors:

1.) Traffic Signals and Signs (45.7)

2.) Wrong Side of Road (14.8)

3.) Unsafe Lane Change (11)

HIN ID: 16.

Extents: Eastern Avenue from Whitney Avenue to Arden Way.

Length: 2.6 miles.

Class 2 Length: 4.6 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 31.

Factors:

1.) Other Hazardous Violation (120)

2.) Automobile Right of Way (11)

3.) Automobile Right of Way (11)

HIN ID: 17.

Extents: Greenback Lane from Fair Oaks Boulevard to Madison Avenue.

Length: 3.9 miles.

Class 2 Length: 4.8 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 19.

Factors:

1.) Improper Turning (11)

2.) Wrong Side of Road (10.2)

3.) Automobile Right of Way (8.5)

HIN ID: 18.

Extents: Dewey Drive from Coyle Avenue to Will Rogers Drive.

Length: 1.1 miles.

Class 2 Length: 0.9 miles.

Class 3 Length: 0.0 miles.

Intersection: 16.

Factors:

1.) Wrong Side of Road (25.4)

2.) Improper Turning (11)

3.) Improper Turning (11)

Appendix A-3: High Injury Collisions Nearby Schools: (Quarter-Mile Radius)

Chapter cover photo shows a stretch of road lined with trees, with a bike lane visible on one side, and some buildings on the other.

Table A-17: High Injury Collisions Nearby Schools: (Quarter-Mile Radius)

School name will be listed first, followed by the corresponding data.

Gateway International:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 190.

- EPDO per Collision: 190.

Kohler Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 190.
- EPDO per Collision: 190.

Orchard Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 190.
- EPDO per Collision: 190.

Rio Linda High:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 386.
- EPDO per Collision: 128.7.

Dry Creek Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 386.
- EPDO per Collision: 128.7.

Rio Linda Preparatory Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 386.

- EPDO per Collision: 128.7.

Samuel Kennedy Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 201.
- EPDO per Collision: 100.5.

Sequoia Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 201.
- EPDO per Collision: 100.5.

Pacific Career and Technology High:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 196.
- EPDO per Collision: 98.

David Reese Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 408.
- EPDO per Collision: 81.6.

James Rutter Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 408.

- EPDO per Collision: 81.6.

Visions In Education:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 212.
- EPDO per Collision: 70.7.

John Barrett Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 202.
- EPDO per Collision: 67.3.

Arcade Fundamental Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 333.
- EPDO per Collision: 66.6.

Ethel I. Baker Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 126.
- EPDO per Collision: 63.

Del Campo High:

- FREQUENCY: 9.
- EPDO: 437.

- EPDO per Collision: 48.6.

Will Rogers Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 9.
- EPDO: 437.
- EPDO per Collision: 48.6.

Paseo Grande Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 142.
- EPDO per Collision: 47.3.

Frontier Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 132.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.

Thomas Kelly Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 11.
- EPDO: 454.
- EPDO per Collision: 41.3.

Harry Dewey Fundamental Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 12.
- EPDO: 460.

- EPDO per Collision: 38.3.

Encina Preparatory High:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 143.
- EPDO per Collision: 35.8.

Greer Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 143.
- EPDO per Collision: 35.8.

Florin Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 149.
- EPDO per Collision: 29.8.

Albert Einstein Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 6.
- EPDO: 170.
- EPDO per Collision: 28.3.

Sheldon High*:

- FREQUENCY: 15.
- EPDO: 333.

- EPDO per Collision: 22.2.

T. R. Smedberg Middle*:

- FREQUENCY: 15.
- EPDO: 333.
- EPDO per Collision: 22.2.

Whitney Avenue Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 8.
- EPDO: 177.
- EPDO per Collision: 22.1.

El Centro Jr./Sr. High:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 44.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Rosemont High:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 44.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Bella Vista High:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 44.

- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Futures High:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 33.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Frederick Joyce Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 33.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

California Montessori Project-San Juan Campus:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 22.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Del Paso Manor Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 22.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Pershing Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 22.

- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Ridgepoint Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 22.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Foothill Oaks Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 22.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Paramount Collegiate Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 22.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Calvine High:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Mather Heights Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.

- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Isador Cohen Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

O. W. Erlewine Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

James Marshall Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Golden Empire Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Orange Grove Adult Education:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.

- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Rio Americano High:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Oakview Community Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Charles Peck Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Community Outreach Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Community Collaborative Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.

- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Twin Rivers Adult School - Murchison Center:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 11.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.

Barrett Ranch Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 9.
- EPDO: 94.
- EPDO per Collision: 10.4.

Antelope High:

- FREQUENCY: 7.
- EPDO: 72.
- EPDO per Collision: 10.3.

Andrew Carnegie Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 6.
- EPDO: 56.
- EPDO per Collision: 9.3.

Orangevale Open K-8:

- FREQUENCY: 6.
- EPDO: 56.

- EPDO per Collision: 9.3.

Isabelle Jackson Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 28.
- EPDO per Collision: 9.3.

Winston Churchill Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 28.
- EPDO per Collision: 9.3.

Carmichael Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 8.
- EPDO: 73.
- EPDO per Collision: 9.1.

Miles P. Richmond:

- FREQUENCY: 10.
- EPDO: 85.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.5.

Oak Hill Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 17.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.5.

Highlands High:

- FREQUENCY: 13.
- EPDO: 108.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.3.

Hillsdale Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 13.
- EPDO: 108.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.3.

Warren A. Allison Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 9.
- EPDO: 74.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.2.

Mira Loma High:

- FREQUENCY: 7.
- EPDO: 57.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.1.

San Juan Choices Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 40.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.

El Camino Fundamental High:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 40.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.

Woodridge Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 40.
- EPDO per Collision: 8.

Antelope Crossing Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 23.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.7.

Pasadena Avenue Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 23.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.7.

Florin High:

- FREQUENCY: 7.
- EPDO: 52.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.4.

Antelope Meadows Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 29.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.3.

Green Oaks Fundamental Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 29.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.3.

Howe Avenue Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 29.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.3.

Louis Pasteur Fundamental Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 29.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.3.

Global Youth Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 29.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.3.

Center High:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 29.
- EPDO per Collision: 7.3.

Arden Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 18.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Elwood J. Keema High:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 18.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Palmiter Special Education:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 12.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Elinor Lincoln Hickey Jr./Sr. High:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 12.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Fortune:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 12.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Bowling Green Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 12.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Fern Bacon Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 12.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Casa Roble Fundamental High:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 12.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Oakdale Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 2.
- EPDO: 12.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Olive Grove Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Gerber Jr./Sr. High:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Arnold Adreani Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Elk Grove Adult Education:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Maeola E. Beitzel Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Aspire Alexander Twilight College Preparatory Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Aspire Alexander Twilight Secondary Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

La Vista Center:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Dyer-Kelly Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

McClellan High: (Continuation)

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Foothill High:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Village Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Foothill Ranch Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.

Note: Schools marked by a *, Sheldon High and Smedberg Middle Schools, share a campus.

Appendix A-4: High Injury Collisions Near Schools: (Two-Mile Radius)

Chapter cover is of a busy street with many cars visible. The street is lined with a sidewalk and bike lane, and palm trees stand along the center island.

Table A-18: High Injury Collisions Nearby Schools: (Two-Mile Radius)

School name will be listed first, followed by the corresponding data.

Franklin Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 341.
- EPDO per Collision: 113.7.

Westside Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 33.
- EPDO: 3598.
- EPDO per Collision: 109.0.

Westside Preparatory Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 33.
- EPDO: 3598.

- EPDO per Collision: 109.0.

Dry Creek Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 35.
- EPDO: 3759.
- EPDO per Collision: 107.4.

Rio Linda High:

- FREQUENCY: 34.
- EPDO: 3594.
- EPDO per Collision: 105.7.

Rio Linda Preparatory Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 34.
- EPDO: 3594.
- EPDO per Collision: 105.7.

Orchard Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 36.
- EPDO: 3760.
- EPDO per Collision: 104.4.

Elverta Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 17.
- EPDO: 1474.

- EPDO per Collision: 86.7.

Heritage Peak Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 43.
- EPDO: 3588.
- EPDO per Collision: 83.4.

Pathways Community Day:

- FREQUENCY: 43.
- EPDO: 3588.
- EPDO per Collision: 83.4.

Mather Heights Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 5.
- EPDO: 318.
- EPDO per Collision: 63.6.

Alpha Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 177.
- EPDO per Collision: 59.0.

Alpha Technology Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 3.
- EPDO: 177.

- EPDO per Collision: 59.0.

Mary Deterding Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 145.
- EPDO: 7276.
- EPDO per Collision: 50.2.

Del Dayo Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 82.
- EPDO: 4099.
- EPDO per Collision: 50.0.

Mira Loma High:

- FREQUENCY: 272.
- EPDO: 13568.
- EPDO per Collision: 49.9.

Whitney Avenue Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 260.
- EPDO: 12925.
- EPDO per Collision: 49.7.

Options for Youth-San Juan:

- FREQUENCY: 145.
- EPDO: 7092.

- EPDO per Collision: 48.9.

Community Outreach Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 253.
- EPDO: 12369.
- EPDO per Collision: 48.9.

Community Collaborative Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 248.
- EPDO: 12031.
- EPDO per Collision: 48.5.

Twin Rivers Adult School—Murchison Center:

- FREQUENCY: 248.
- EPDO: 12031.
- EPDO per Collision: 48.5.

Futures High:

- FREQUENCY: 289.
- EPDO: 13858.
- EPDO per Collision: 48.0.

El Camino Fundamental High:

- FREQUENCY: 236.
- EPDO: 11230.

- EPDO per Collision: 47.6.

Frederick Joyce Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 282.
- EPDO: 13274.
- EPDO per Collision: 47.1.

Pasadena Avenue Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 345.
- EPDO: 16228.
- EPDO per Collision: 47.0.

Fortune:

- FREQUENCY: 296.
- EPDO: 13841.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.8.

California Montessori Project-San Juan Campus:

- FREQUENCY: 271.
- EPDO: 12653.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.7.

Pacific Career and Technology High:

- FREQUENCY: 293.
- EPDO: 13650.

- EPDO per Collision: 46.6.

James R. Cowan Fundamental Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 276.
- EPDO: 12836.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.5.

Arcade Fundamental Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 284.
- EPDO: 13172.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.4.

Ottomon Way Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 38.
- EPDO: 1759.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.3.

Oakdale Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 296.
- EPDO: 13699.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.3.

Daylor (William) High (Continuation):

- FREQUENCY: 271.
- EPDO: 12514.

- EPDO per Collision: 46.2.

La Entrada Continuation High:

- FREQUENCY: 318.
- EPDO: 14673.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.1.

Laurel Ruff Center:

- FREQUENCY: 318.
- EPDO: 14673.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.1.

Kohler Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 347.
- EPDO: 15995.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.1.

Woodridge Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 369.
- EPDO: 17007.
- EPDO per Collision: 46.1.

Paseo Grande Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 317.
- EPDO: 14544.

- EPDO per Collision: 45.9.

Will Rogers Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 185.
- EPDO: 8475.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.8.

Winston Churchill Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 249.
- EPDO: 11404.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.8.

North Country Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 189.
- EPDO: 8650.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.8.

Samuel Kennedy Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 262.
- EPDO: 11974.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.7.

Thomas Kelly Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 239.
- EPDO: 10911.

- EPDO per Collision: 45.7.

Del Campo High:

- FREQUENCY: 186.
- EPDO: 8486.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.6.

Harry Dewey Fundamental Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 172.
- EPDO: 7835.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.6.

Elwood J. Keema High:

- FREQUENCY: 260.
- EPDO: 11834.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.5.

David Reese Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 259.
- EPDO: 11732.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.3.

James Rutter Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 259.
- EPDO: 11732.

- EPDO per Collision: 45.3.

Andrew Carnegie Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 101.
- EPDO: 4563.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.2.

Sierra View Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 200.
- EPDO: 9034.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.2.

Carmichael Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 198.
- EPDO: 8942.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.2.

Charles Peck Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 227.
- EPDO: 10247.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.1.

Twin Lakes Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 66.
- EPDO: 2976.

- EPDO per Collision: 45.1.

Dyer-Kelly Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 265.
- EPDO: 11937.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.0.

Marvin Marshall Preschool and Children's Center:

- FREQUENCY: 181.
- EPDO: 8148.
- EPDO per Collision: 45.0.

Orangevale Open K-8:

- FREQUENCY: 102.
- EPDO: 4579.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.9.

Village Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 254.
- EPDO: 11396.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.9.

Pioneer Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 331.
- EPDO: 14835.

- EPDO per Collision: 44.8.

Madison Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 320.
- EPDO: 14321.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.8.

Gold River Discovery Center K-8:

- FREQUENCY: 43.
- EPDO: 1923.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.7.

Antelope High:

- FREQUENCY: 170.
- EPDO: 7592.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.7.

Nicholas Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 275.
- EPDO: 12272.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.6.

Coyle Avenue Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 178.
- EPDO: 7930.

- EPDO per Collision: 44.6.

Miles P. Richmond:

- FREQUENCY: 342.
- EPDO: 15230.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.5.

Mission Avenue Open Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 246.
- EPDO: 10903.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.3.

Foothill Ranch Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 340.
- EPDO: 15039.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.2.

Frontier Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 307.
- EPDO: 13553.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.1.

Foothill High:

- FREQUENCY: 341.
- EPDO: 15045.

- EPDO per Collision: 44.1.

Pacific Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 238.
- EPDO: 10499.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.1.

Olive Grove Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 138.
- EPDO: 6072.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.0.

San Juan Choices Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 200.
- EPDO: 8797.
- EPDO per Collision: 44.0.

Bowling Green Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 242.
- EPDO: 10617.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.9.

Albert Schweitzer Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 167.
- EPDO: 7279.

- EPDO per Collision: 43.6.

Barrett Ranch Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 173.
- EPDO: 7535.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.6.

Warren A. Allison Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 270.
- EPDO: 11735.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.5.

Foothill Oaks Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 171.
- EPDO: 7422.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.4.

Golden Valley Charter School of Sacramento:

- FREQUENCY: 64.
- EPDO: 2775.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.4.

Aspire Alexander Twilight College Preparatory Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 333.
- EPDO: 14436.

- EPDO per Collision: 43.4.

Aspire Alexander Twilight Secondary Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 333.
- EPDO: 14436.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.4.

Del Paso Manor Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 275.
- EPDO: 11896.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.3.

La Vista Center:

- FREQUENCY: 116.
- EPDO: 5011.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.2.

Hillsdale Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 334.
- EPDO: 14423.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.2.

Parkway Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 236.
- EPDO: 10184.

- EPDO per Collision: 43.2.

Ethel I. Baker Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 219.
- EPDO: 9436.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.1.

Orange Grove Adult Education:

- FREQUENCY: 371.
- EPDO: 15957.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.0.

Highlands High:

- FREQUENCY: 336.
- EPDO: 14435.
- EPDO per Collision: 43.0.

Fern Bacon Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 244.
- EPDO: 10475.
- EPDO per Collision: 42.9.

John Barrett Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 192.
- EPDO: 8235.

- EPDO per Collision: 42.9.

Paramount Collegiate Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 274.
- EPDO: 11706.
- EPDO per Collision: 42.7.

Visions In Education:

- FREQUENCY: 277.
- EPDO: 11829.
- EPDO per Collision: 42.7.

Cottage Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 379.
- EPDO: 16138.
- EPDO per Collision: 42.6.

Creative Connections Arts Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 220.
- EPDO: 9353.
- EPDO per Collision: 42.5.

Pershing Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 86.
- EPDO: 3633.

- EPDO per Collision: 42.2.

Ridgepoint Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 225.
- EPDO: 9497.
- EPDO per Collision: 42.2.

Elk Grove Adult Education:

- FREQUENCY: 199.
- EPDO: 8372.
- EPDO per Collision: 42.1.

Gerber Jr./Sr. High:

- FREQUENCY: 200.
- EPDO: 8383.
- EPDO per Collision: 41.9.

Florin Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 226.
- EPDO: 9458.
- EPDO per Collision: 41.8.

Palmiter Special Education:

- FREQUENCY: 288.
- EPDO: 12010.

- EPDO per Collision: 41.7.

Elinor Lincoln Hickey Jr./Sr. High:

- FREQUENCY: 294.
- EPDO: 12170.
- EPDO per Collision: 41.4.

Howe Avenue Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 319.
- EPDO: 13154.
- EPDO per Collision: 41.2.

Ralph Richardson Center:

- FREQUENCY: 168.
- EPDO: 6926.
- EPDO per Collision: 41.2.

Starr King K-8:

- FREQUENCY: 169.
- EPDO: 6932.
- EPDO per Collision: 41.0.

El Sereno Alternative Education:

- FREQUENCY: 81.
- EPDO: 3300.

- EPDO per Collision: 40.7.

Greer Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 269.
- EPDO: 10856.
- EPDO per Collision: 40.4.

Mariemont Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 188.
- EPDO: 7528.
- EPDO per Collision: 40.0.

Antelope Meadows Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 124.
- EPDO: 4940.
- EPDO per Collision: 39.8.

Rio Americano High:

- FREQUENCY: 118.
- EPDO: 4677.
- EPDO per Collision: 39.6.

Golden Valley Orchard:

- FREQUENCY: 81.
- EPDO: 3210.

- EPDO per Collision: 39.6.

El Centro Jr./Sr. High:

- FREQUENCY: 75.
- EPDO: 2959.
- EPDO per Collision: 39.5.

Rosemont High:

- FREQUENCY: 75.
- EPDO: 2959.
- EPDO per Collision: 39.5.

Encina Preparatory High:

- FREQUENCY: 307.
- EPDO: 12108.
- EPDO per Collision: 39.4.

Antelope Crossing Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 106.
- EPDO: 4171.
- EPDO per Collision: 39.3.

Morgan Jr./Sr. High:

- FREQUENCY: 81.
- EPDO: 3169.

- EPDO per Collision: 39.1.

Cyril Spinelli Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 146.
- EPDO: 5668.
- EPDO per Collision: 38.8.

Green Oaks Fundamental Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 61.
- EPDO: 2349.
- EPDO per Collision: 38.5.

Anna Kirchgater Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 155.
- EPDO: 5945.
- EPDO per Collision: 38.4.

Cameron Ranch Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 293.
- EPDO: 11209.
- EPDO per Collision: 38.3.

James Marshall Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 89.
- EPDO: 3401.

- EPDO per Collision: 38.2.

Golden Empire Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 71.
- EPDO: 2707.
- EPDO per Collision: 38.1.

Thomas Edison Language Institute:

- FREQUENCY: 274.
- EPDO: 10433.
- EPDO per Collision: 38.1.

Sequoia Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 99.
- EPDO: 3769.
- EPDO per Collision: 38.1.

Northridge Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 89.
- EPDO: 3372.
- EPDO per Collision: 37.9.

Arden Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 315.
- EPDO: 11868.

- EPDO per Collision: 37.7.

Arthur S. Dudley Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 135.
- EPDO: 5075.
- EPDO per Collision: 37.6.

Bella Vista High:

- FREQUENCY: 94.
- EPDO: 3497.
- EPDO per Collision: 37.2.

Casa Roble Fundamental High:

- FREQUENCY: 44.
- EPDO: 1626.
- EPDO per Collision: 37.0.

Isador Cohen Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 110.
- EPDO: 4049.
- EPDO per Collision: 36.8.

Earl Legette Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 87.
- EPDO: 3201.

- EPDO per Collision: 36.8.

Louis Pasteur Fundamental Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 66.
- EPDO: 2404.
- EPDO per Collision: 36.4.

O. W. Erlewine Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 119.
- EPDO: 4326.
- EPDO per Collision: 36.4.

Albert Einstein Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 90.
- EPDO: 3258.
- EPDO per Collision: 36.2.

Sierra-Enterprise Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 29.
- EPDO: 1024.
- EPDO per Collision: 35.3.

Florin High:

- FREQUENCY: 181.
- EPDO: 6387.

- EPDO per Collision: 35.3.

Gateway International:

- FREQUENCY: 237.
- EPDO: 8124.
- EPDO per Collision: 34.3.

Oak Hill Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 125.
- EPDO: 4255.
- EPDO per Collision: 34.0.

Global Youth Charter:

- FREQUENCY: 86.
- EPDO: 2843.
- EPDO per Collision: 33.1.

Sierra Oaks K-8:

- FREQUENCY: 154.
- EPDO: 5063.
- EPDO per Collision: 32.9.

Center High:

- FREQUENCY: 87.
- EPDO: 2849.

- EPDO per Collision: 32.7.

Oakview Community Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 53.
- EPDO: 1670.
- EPDO per Collision: 31.5.

Arnold Adreani Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 23.
- EPDO: 709.
- EPDO per Collision: 30.8.

Isabelle Jackson Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 147.
- EPDO: 4484.
  EPDO per Collision: 30.5.

Mary Tsukamoto Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 122.
- EPDO: 3544.
- EPDO per Collision: 29.0.

Trajan Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 65.
- EPDO: 1876.
- EPDO per Collision: 28.9.

National University Academy Robla:

- FREQUENCY: 6.
- EPDO: 160.
- EPDO per Collision: 26.7.

McClellan High (Continuation):

- FREQUENCY: 59.
- EPDO: 1488.
- EPDO per Collision: 25.2.

Calvine High:

- FREQUENCY: 89.
- EPDO: 2208.
- EPDO per Collision: 24.8.

Robert J. Fite Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 53.
- EPDO: 1291.
- EPDO per Collision: 24.4.

T. R. Smedberg Middle:

- FREQUENCY: 54.
- EPDO: 1302.
- EPDO per Collision: 24.1.

Maeola E. Beitzel Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 79.
- EPDO: 1850.
- EPDO per Collision: 23.4.

Sheldon High:

- FREQUENCY: 51.
- EPDO: 1170.
- EPDO per Collision: 22.9.

Mather Youth Academy:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 44.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.0.

Walnut Grove Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 4.
- EPDO: 44.
- EPDO per Collision: 11.0.

C. W. Dillard Elementary:

- FREQUENCY: 1.
- EPDO: 6.
- EPDO per Collision: 6.0.

Appendix B: Community Engagement:

Chapter cover has a bike in motion set in the background, with two ducks in the foreground, watching as the biker rides by.

Public Engagement Plan:

INTRODUCTION:

Project Background:

Sacramento County is updating and combining their prior Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plans into a countywide Active Transportation Plan. Working with Alta Planning + Design, WALKSacramento and DKS, the County seeks to engage the County's environmental justice communities, non-English speaking households, people without internet access, and other hard-to-reach populations to create a plan that makes walking, bicycling and active modes safe and accessible for all.

Objectives:

The fundamental objectives of the Public Engagement Plan (PEP) are to:

- Ensure that those with a stake in Sacramento County ATP are identified;
- Identify outreach techniques for engaging these stakeholders;

- Ensure all stakeholders have open access to and input in the decision-making process and are provided with information about the project as it moves forward;
- Provide reasonable public access to technical and other information about the project; and
- Ensure the concerns, issues and preferences of stakeholders are gathered, and are reflected in the final document.

Priority Audiences:

- People who use active transportation as a frequent mode of transportation. (Walk, bike, rolling, mobility devices, etc.)
- People who are interested in biking but perceive barriers.
- Households with zero or one vehicle.
- Residents of Environmental Justice communities:
  - North Highlands/Foothill Farms,
  - West Arden Arcade,
  - North Vineyard,
  - South Sacramento.
- Households with limited English- speaking proficiency.
- Households with no internet access.

Stakeholders:

Organized Interest Groups:

The following groups are prioritized for stakeholder meetings during Phase 1 outreach. These groups represent priority audiences throughout the County and in EJ communities and can provide a high-level overview of current conditions and priorities for active transportation that are relevant to their audiences.

Bike and Active Transportation Organizations:

- Sacramento County Bicycle Advisory Committee.
- Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates.
- Folsom Area Bicycle Advocates.
- Bike Lab.
- Project Hero.
- Contagious Wheels.
- Sacramento Wheelmen Bicycle Group.
- Sacramento Bike Hikers.

Transportation Management Agencies:

- Sacramento Transportation Management Agency.
- 50 Corridor Transportation Management Agency.
- North Natomas Jibe.
- South Natomas Transportation Management Agency.
- McClellan Transportation Management Agency.
- Power Inn Alliance Disability Organizations.
- Sacramento County Disability Advisory Commission.
- Resources for Independent Living.
- Society for the Blind.
- On My Own Community Services.
- Seeds of Partnerships.
- NorCal Services for Deaf and Hard of Hearing.
- ACB Capital Chapter of the California Council of the Blind.
- Alta California Regional Center.
- American Association of People with Disabilities. (AAPD)
- California Association of the Deaf.
- Californians for Disability Rights.

- Disability Rights Advocates.
- Disability Rights California.
- Easterseals Superior California.
- Pride Industries.
- SacRT Access Services.
- SacRT Mobility Advisory Council.
- United Cerebral Palsy of Sacramento and Northern California.
- Wounded Warrior Project.

Environmental Justice Organizations:

- Red Black and Green EJ Coalition.
- Impact Sacramento.
- Stephens Foundation.
- Environmental Council of Sacramento.
- Organize Sacramento.
- Sacramento Tree Foundation.
- Sacramento Steps Forward.
- Everyday Impact Consulting.
- Sierra Club Sacramento.

Community-Based Organizations/ Cultural Brokers:

- Building Healthy Communities.
- Black Child Legacy Campaign.
- Sacramento Area Congregations Together. (SacACT)
- United Latinos.
- Asian Resources.
- Roberts Family Development Center.
- Mutual Assistance Network.

- Latino Coalition for a Healthy California. (LCHC)
- Lao Family Community Development.
- Iu-Mien Community Services.
- Gujarati Samaj of Sacramento.
- Greater Sacramento Urban League.
- Hmong Innovating Politics. (HIP)
- La Familia Counseling Center.

Sacramento County Agencies:

- Public Health Department.
- Department of Human Assistance.
- Planning and Environmental Review.
- Emergency Services.
- Sheriff's Department.
- Office of Education.
- Disability Compliance Office.
- Therapeutic Recreation Services.

Youth Organizations:

- First 5 Sacramento.
- Sacramento County Youth Commission.
- SACOG Youth Leadership Academy.
- Pro Youth and Families.
- Sacramento Chinese Community Service Center.
- 916 Ink.
- Boys and Girls Club of Greater Sacramento.
- Hands4Hope.
- Omni Youth Programs.

- Sol Collective.
- Youth Development Network.

Older Adult Organizations:

- AARP – Sacramento Chapter.
- Sacramento County Adult and Aging Commission.
- Older Women's League, Sacramento Capitol.
- Agency on Aging Area 4.
- ACC Senior Services.

Health Organizations:

- American Heart Association – Sacramento Chapter.
- Breathe California.
- Safe Kids Greater Sacramento.
- UCD Trauma Prevention.
- Health Education Council.

Transit Agencies:

- Sacramento Regional Transit.
- E-Tran.
- South County Transit.
- Paratransit.

Neighboring Jurisdictions:

- City of Sacramento.
- City of Rancho Cordova.
- City of Elk Grove.

- City of Folsom.
- City of Citrus Heights.
- City of Isleton.
- City of Galt.
- Sutter County.
- Placer County.
- El Dorado County.
- Amador County.
- San Joaquin County.
- Solano County.
- Yolo County.

Community-Focused Engagement Partners:

The following groups are community- oriented organizations that may be able to support community-focused engagement activities such as pop-up events.

Locations will be listed first, followed by the corresponding organizations:

Countywide:

- Sacramento Food Bank and Family Services.
- ACC Senior Services.
- Hmong Innovating Politics.
- Iu-Mien Community Services.
- Lao Family Community Development.
- Community Resource Project.
- Mutual Assistance Network.
- Greater Sacramento Urban League.

North Highlands/ Foothill Farms:

- Impact Sac.
- Black Child Legacy of North Highlands/Foothill Farms.
- Liberty Towers.
- North Highlands Parks and Recreation District.
- Sunrise Parks and Recreation District.
- 80 Watt District Property Business Improvement District.
- North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce.
- North Highlands/Foothill Farms CPAC.

West Arden-Arcade:

- Opening Doors Inc.
- World Relief Sacramento.
- Black Child Legacy of Arden Arcade.
- Fulton-El Camino Parks District.
- Arcade Manor Parks District.
- Arden Park Parks District.
- Mission Oaks Park District.
- Greater Arden Chamber of Commerce.
- Arden Arcade CPAC.

Vineyard:

- Southgate Recreation and Parks District.
- Vineyard CPAC.

South Sacramento:

- Martin Luther King Jr. Neighborhood Association.
- Franklin Neighborhood Development Corporation.
- Building Healthy Communities.
- La Familia Counseling Center.
- Southgate Recreation and Parks District.
- Mack Road Partnership.
- Stockton Blvd Partnership.
- South Sacramento CPAC.
- Pro Youth and Families.

Rural County: (Delta and East communities)

- California Rural Legal Assistance.
- River Delta USD.
- Sacramento County Farm Bureau.
- Isleton Chamber of Commerce.
- California FFA Center.
- Rancho Murieta Community Services District.
- Galt Historical Society.

Youth-Focused Engagement Partners:

The following groups are youth-oriented organizations that may be able to support youth-focused engagement activities such as Video and Photo Voice, which are projects where students highlight and describe their concerns and priorities around transportation and the built environment through videos or photo journals.

- Boys and Girls Club of Greater Sacramento.
- Sacramento Chinese Community Service Center.
- Roberts Family Development Center.
- 916 Ink.

- Sol Collective.
- Youth Development Network.
- Onmi Youth Programs.
- Hands4Hope.
- Pro Youth and Families.
- School Districts:
  - Twin Rivers Unified School District,
  - Sacramento City Unified School District,
  - Elk Grove Unified School District,
  - San Juan Unified School District,
  - Folsom Cordova Unified School District.

Promotional Partners:

These groups can help spread the word about the project, share the survey and other resources, and direct people to the website for additional input and information.

- County Supervisor Districts:
  - Supervisor Susan Peters.
  - Supervisor Patrick Kennedy.
  - Supervisor Don Nottoli.
  - Supervisor Phil Serna.
  - Supervisor Sue Frost.
- Countywide Community-Based Organizations:
  - International Rescue Committee– Sacramento.
  - Sacramento Tree Foundation.
  - Sacramento Valley Ministers' Wives & Ministers' Widows.
  - United Way Capital Region.
  - Sacramento Transit Rider’s Union.
- Business and Chambers of Commerce:
  - Hispanic Chamber.
  - Black Chamber.

- Greater Sacramento Vietnamese American Chamber.
- Asian Pacific Chamber.
- Slavic American Chamber.
- Metro Chamber.
- California Delta Chamber.
- Carmichael Chamber.
- Citrus Heights Chamber.
- East Sacramento Chamber.
- Elk Grove Chamber.
- Fair Oaks Chamber.
- Folsom Chamber.
- Galt Chamber.
- Greater Arden Chamber.
- Isleton Chamber.
- North Sacramento Chamber.
- Orangevale Chamber.
- Rancho Cordova Chamber.
- Sacramento Area Women's Chamber.

• Rainbow Chamber:

- Local Media.
- Sacramento Bee.
- Sacramento Observer.
- Sacramento News and Review.
- Sac Cultural Hub.
- KDEE. (Black Chamber radio station)
- Latino 97.9 radio station.
- Sacramento Business Journal.
- Capital Public Radio. (NPR)
- Sacramento 365.
- Entercom.

LOCATION-SPECIFIC STAKEHOLDERS:

The following table lists stakeholders specific to communities within the County, with a priority emphasis on the County's EJ communities.

North Highlands/ Foothill Farms:

Community Based Organizations and Neighborhood Group:

- Impact Sac.
- Black Child Legacy of North Highlands/ Foothill Farms.
- 80 Watt District Property Business Improvement District.
- North Sacramento Chamber of Commerce.
- North Highlands/ Foothill Farms CPAC.

School Districts:

- Twin Rivers Unified School District.

Park Districts:

- North Highlands.
- Sunrise.

Elected Officials:

- Supervisor Susan Peters.

West Arden Arcade:

Community Based Organizations and Neighborhood Group:

- Opening Doors Inc.
- World Relief Sacramento.
- Black Child Legacy of Arden Arcade.
- Greater Arden Chamber of Commerce.

- Arden Arcade CPAC.

School Districts:

- San Juan Unified School District.

Park Districts:

- Fulton-El Camino.
- Arcade Manor.
- Arden Park.
- Mission Oaks.

Elected Officials:

- Supervisor Susan Peters.

North Vineyard:

Community Based Organizations and Neighborhood Group:

- Vineyard CPAC.

School Districts:

- Elk Grove Unified School District.

Park Districts:

- Southgate.

Elected Officials:

- Supervisor Don Nottoli.

South Sacramento:

Community Based Organizations and Neighborhood Group:

- Martin Luther King Jr. Neighborhood Association.
- Franklin Neighborhood Development Corporation.
- Building Healthy Communities.
- La Familia Counseling Center.
- Mack Road Partnership.
- Stockton Blvd Partnership.
- South Sacramento CPAC.

School Districts:

- Sacramento City Unified School District.
- Elk Grove Unified School District.

Park Districts:

- Southgate.

Elected Officials:

- Supervisor Patrick Kennedy.

Non-EJ Unincorporated:

Community Based Organizations and Neighborhood Group:

- Fair Oaks Chamber of Commerce.
- Orangevale Chamber of Commerce.
- Carmichael Chamber of Commerce.
- California Delta Chamber of Commerce.
- Antelope CPAC.
- Carmichael/Old Foothill Farms CPAC.
- Cordova CPAC.
- Cosumnes CPAC.
- Delta CPAC.

- Fair Oaks CPAC.
- Natomas CPAC.
- Orangevale CPAC.
- Rio Linda/Elverta CPAC.
- Southeast Area CPAC.

School Districts:

- Aroche Union.
- Center Joint Unified.
- Elverta Joint.
- Folsom Cordova Unified.
- Galt Joint Union.
- Natomas Unified.
- River Delta Unified.
- Robla.

Park Districts:

- Rio Linda/Elverta.
- Orangevale.
- Arcade Creek.
- Carmichael.
- Fair Oaks.
- Cordova.
- Wilton Cosumnes.
- Elk Grove.
- County Service Area Galt.
- County Service Area Delta.

Elected Officials:

- Supervisor Phil Serna.
- Supervisor Sue Frost.

BIKE BUSINESSES:

The following list of bike businesses will be included in outreach efforts.

- Bob's Cycle Center.
- Neighborhood Bike Shop of Antelope.
- Kinetic Cycles.
- Carmichael Bike Shop.
- Laid Back Cycles.
- Biker Bar & Café.
- Bike Medic.
- Green Flag Racing.
- Big Dream Bike Tours LLC.
- River Rat Raft Rental Inc.
- AR Cycles.
- AlphaBent.
- Practical Cycle.

Outreach Phases, Goals, and Strategies:

The public outreach process will have two major phases: the first phase will solicit feedback on existing conditions, key destinations, and community concerns (Task 2), while the second phase will engage the public to provide feedback on the active transportation network analysis (Task 4) and the list and prioritization of recommended projects (Task 5). Note that the dates for each phase below are draft and subject to change.

PHASE 1:

Phase 1 will center on listening to the community and soliciting feedback on existing conditions, key destinations, and community concerns. It will run from August 2020 to November/ December 2020.

Phase 1 Goals:

- Ensure that those with a stake in Sacramento County ATP are identified;
- Identify outreach techniques for engaging these stakeholders;
- Ensure all stakeholders are provided with information about the project as it moves forward;
- Develop a shared vision and goals for active transportation in the County;
- Identify key corridors and destinations, active transportation infrastructure gaps, and opportunities for improvement;
- Ensure the concerns and issues of stakeholders are heard and gathered.

Phase 1 Messaging:

- We are working to create an Active Transportation Plan to make it safer, easier, and more comfortable for people all across the County to get around by foot and by bicycle.
- Focus on identifying issues, not solutions:
    1. How do you get around? How would you like to get around? (to work, school, parks, stores, etc.)
    2. [If they bike/walk] Why do you bike and walk? What do you like about it? What don't you like about it?
    3. [If they don't bike/walk] How do you get around? Why don't you walk and bike? When in your life did you walk and bike? What changed?

PHASE 2:

Phase 2 will center on presenting the draft project and program recommendations, prioritization, design guidelines, and active transportation network analysis to the community, and soliciting feedback in order to make the final project and program recommendations, and prioritization. It will run from March to July 2021.

Phase 2 Goals:

- Ensure that stakeholders identified in Phase 1 are engaged;
- Ensure all stakeholders are provided with information about the project as it moves forward, including the draft project and program recommendations, prioritization, design guidelines, and active transportation network analysis;
- Receive feedback on desired adjustments to draft project and program recommendations, prioritization, and design guidelines;
- Ensure the concerns and issues of stakeholders are heard and gathered.

Phase 2 Messaging:

- In Phase 1, we heard the following concerns from residents of Sacramento County:
    - We are proposing the following projects and programs, prioritization, and design guidelines. Looking at these, is anything missing? Inaccurate?

Stakeholder Meeting and Pop-up Summaries:

PHASE 1 STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS:

North Vineyard – January 19, 2021:

Attendees:

3 project staff, 1 project partner, and 1 community member participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom.

- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Anne Okafor, WALKSacramento.
- Leah Barrett, 50 Corridor Transportation Management Agency.
- 1 community member.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Benefits of walking: meditative, relaxing, can enjoy social interaction with neighbors.
- Bicyclists tend to be the most vocal group, so ensure that the voices of people who walk and use other forms of active transportation are heard through this process as well (particularly older adults and people with disabilities).
- Walking routes and destinations include:
    1. Camden Lake Trail.
    2. 3-4 mile loop from Meadowhaven Drive to Tillotson Parkway and back around to Spengler Drive.

b.) Challenges:

- The biggest concern is the interaction between pedestrians and bicyclists on shared paths and trails. Bicyclists often move fast and don't slow down for pedestrians, creating concerns for collisions.
- Bikes often use sidewalks instead of bike lanes, which forces pedestrians into the street.
- Lack of signage indicating shared streets for bikes and cars.
- Lots of high speed arterials and wide streets in the Vineyard area that make walking and biking uncomfortable, such as Gerber Road, Elk Grove Florin Road, and Bradshaw Road.
- It doesn't feel safe or practical to use a bike in the Vineyard area. The participant shared a memory of growing up in a small town in Iowa where most people biked for recreation or other trips, and it felt safe because everyone knew each other and people who drove would be very slow and careful around their neighbors. Biking is more challenging in Sacramento because cars move too fast and recklessly and there aren't enough other people out biking to make it feel safe.
- Specific areas of concern:
    1. Meadowhaven Drive is wide enough for bikes and cars, but bikes often prefer to use the separated sidewalk instead which creates concerns for conflicts with pedestrians.
    2. Neighborhood off of Bradshaw and Gerber has no marked bike lanes, and cars parked along the sides make the streets feel cramped to bike through.

c.) Opportunities:

- Designated walking trails would be preferred over shared walking and biking paths. Overall, keeping pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure separate is ideal.
- Four way stop signs force cars and bikes to slow down and makes it safer for people of all modes. The participant indicated the City of Davis as a model to follow.

- Reach out to older adults through senior centers (such as the Elk Grove senior center).
- There are a lot of Asian community members in Vineyard who walk (particularly older adults), so it would be great to connect with them through this process.
- Camden Lake is a popular weekend recreational destination and may be a good opportunity for tabling and sharing more information about the Plan.

Sacramento County Disability Advisory Committee – July 21, 2020:

Attendees:

12 people participated via virtual Skype meeting (including Mikki McDaniel).

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- People with disabilities should specifically be mentioned in the goals.

b.) Public Engagement Plan:

- Add GLBTQ organizations and organizations addressing homelessness. Include Sacramento Self Help Housing.
- Add indigenous peoples' groups: Sacramento Native American Health Center, California Indian Heritage Commission, California Native American Legacy, and California Indian Health Services.

c.) Challenges:

- Combining bicycles and pedestrians into one plan can lead to pedestrian needs getting lost.

- Accessibility needs to be defined in the plan. Accessibility in the disabled rights world means something different than in the transportation world.
- Curb ramps to existing, private driveways are not meeting cross slope standards. A wheelchair user can and has fallen due to the unmanageable and substandard cross slopes at driveways on Watt Avenue.
- Auburn Blvd – full length of street. The sidewalk condition is very poor and traffic moves at highway speed.
- Watt Avenue – A hand-powered cyclist (using a wheelchair modified to also be used with a hand crank) said that he does not like to use bicycle lanes and chooses to use the sidewalk on Watt because of the speed of traffic.
- E-bike riders face a lot of challenges.
- Howe Avenue – Cars on Howe are pulling out beyond limit lines because of blind spots.
- Dell Avenue and Mission Avenue were cited as challenging places to walk and bike.
- The transition from the El Camino Park District to the American River is difficult.
- Difficult Route in Arden: Northrup Avenue to Bell Avenue to Irma Way.

d.) Opportunities:

- Disabled cyclists needs should be addressed.
- Meetings should be noticed such that anyone has the ability to access accommodations and provide them if requested. Accommodations should be made per the individual request, i.e. the format requested according to ADA.
- Wheelchair users differ on the use of “walk” versus “roll”. However, “walk” should be defined in the plan to refer to people who both walk and roll (using a wheelchair) or both terms should be used.
- Diverters along bike lanes and transitional curbing are also helpful for people on the sidewalk as it provides more separation from traffic.

- Buffered bike lanes help low-riding bicyclists (i.e. recumbent or adaptive bicycles).
- Empowerment Park is a good example of how to build a facility. The park has curb ramps and accessible recreational equipment. People should be able to bike and walk to this park.
- The Los Rios School District did a transportation study that is old now, but could provide good information.

Survey and Website Feedback:

- Survey – The survey should be made to be fully accessible. Readers that are used to build the site are not always reflective of a typical user's experience using an accessibility reader.
- Website:
    1. The website is not fully readable by an accessibility reader and should be. The interactive map is not useable at all by an accessibility reader. It is good that a project email and a phone number are posted in order to provide other ways to provide input.
    2. Captioning should be made for deaf and blind (for use by accessibility readers) in any videos.
    3. Any outreach collateral should be in Braille and large print.
    4. Providing captioning or an interpreter for meetings, regardless of whether accommodation has been requested, could be a nice gesture to the Deaf community.

Questions From Attendees:

- How do you interact with the City of Sacramento/American River Parkway, Rancho Cordova on the plan?
- Why are we combining bicycles and pedestrians? Pedestrian needs can get lost in the shuffle.

City of Rancho Cordova – August 27, 2020:

Attendees:

- 7 people participated via virtual Zoom meeting.
- Byron Tang, City of Rancho Cordova.
- Brian Chan, City of Rancho Cordova.
- A Swanson, City of Rancho Cordova.
- Edgar Medina, City of Rancho Cordova.
- Quoc Nham, City of Rancho Cordova.
- Rick Carter, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Input Received:

a.) Challenging Locations for Walking and Biking:

1. Douglas Road, west of Folsom South Canal to Zinfandel Drive:
    - This is a gateway path for cyclists. We would like a paved shoulder be six feet wide.
    - Can it be added to CIP and a project plan?
2. Folsom South Canal connection at Kiefer Blvd.
    - This is a connection to Keifer and New Bridge Plan Area.
    - Sidewalks are needed east of the Kiefer/Folsom South Canal entrance.
3. Old Placerville Road, east of Bradview Drive:
    - Add sidewalks.
4. Sunrise Blvd, north of South Bridge Street:
    - There are a lack of sidewalks on South Bridge east of Sunrise. There is a Class 1 trail, but there could also be a sidewalk.
5. Rod Beaudry, north of Tiffany Lane:

- Would like separation from the road for pedestrians, like an AC trail.

6. White Rock Road:
    - There is a bicycle Lane gap from the end of the City to Grant Line Road.

City of Rancho Cordova does not have a Bicycle Advisory Committee. There is an organization called Bicycle Advocates of Rancho Cordova.

Sacramento Regional Transit Bus Stop Group – September 24, 2020:

Attendees:

- 12 people participated via virtual Microsoft Teams meeting.
- SacRT staff: Sarah Kerber, Mike Fitzpatrick, Sarah Poe, Max West, Blanca Salcedo, Aimee Steele, Eric Oparko, Courtyler, EReitz, Desi Lopez, Sherri Adams, and RNielson.
- SacDOT staff included Mikki McDaniel and Kevin Tan.

Input Received:

a.) Challenges:

- Reaching a bus stop at Madison & Dewey is difficult. Comment was posted on the public input map at walkbikesaccounty.net.
- Bus stop on Folsom at Bradshaw is almost impossible to reach. DOT is already planning to remove.

b.) Opportunities:

- Eric Oparko expressed a desire for RT to be able to give DOT input on bus stop pads for shorter term DOT planning.
- RT has received a grant to survey walking area around bus stops. They will work with WalkSacramento.

Survey and Website Feedback:

- Seemed like there was an issue with viewing comments on receiving end.
- Overall was enthusiastic about the website and its opportunity to highlight infrastructure.

Questions From Attendees:

- How do all the ADA, ATP, Bike, and Pedestrian Plans mesh with each other?
- What is the timing of the bus stop removal on Folsom just west of Bradshaw?

Sacramento Regional Transit Mobility Advisory Council – October 1, 2020:

Attendees:

26 people participated by Microsoft Teams.

- Council Members: Chair Pam Flohr, Vice Chair Jeff Thom, April Wick, Eugene Lozano, Helen O'Connell, William Charles Johnson, Linda Berry, Patti Johnson, and Alan Ruzich.
- SacRT Staff:, Carmen Alba, Rose Patton, Charity Oakley, Sarah Kerber, Dan Thao, Kathy Sachen, James Drake, Craig Norman, Chris Florez, Jamie Poole-Canevari, Wendy Melton, and Andrea Williams-Garcia.
- Guests: Mikki McDaniel, Frank Trullio, Roger Oberholzer, Jeff Tardaguila, Mike Barnbaum.

Input Received:

SacRT Mobility Advisory Council is made up of seniors and disabled community members who advise the SacRT Board on mobility and accessibility issues.

a.) Experiences:

- I needed to be on guard when using the Watt I-80 elevator – dirty.

- At a mid-block crossing on Orange Grove about one fourth mile from the Orange Grove and Auburn intersection, it is hazardous to cross the street. There is the choice to cross mid-block at Pasadena where there is no signal, but there needs to be one. I get cut off by college student drivers turning right and have once been struck by a cyclist [as a pedestrian].
- Bicycles and scooters are not supposed to be on the sidewalk. They are especially hazardous if you have hearing loss. Dogs on leash can also cause a pedestrian to fall. The presence of homeless people make seniors feel very vulnerable.
- Benches have been removed in many public places. Older people can't stop and rest. This is alarming to me. Don't take them all out.
- There is no sidewalk on Florin Perkins north of Belvedere to Jackson Highway to reach the light rail station on the western side. [This location is in the City of Sacramento.]

b.) Challenging Locations for Walking and Biking:

- Fair Oaks and Howe Avenue.
- Sierra Boulevard between Howe and Fulton near the Unitarian Church. There is no sidewalk between the bus stop and the church so you have to walk in the street. Need to complete the sidewalk.
- Crossing streets where there are railroad tracks.
- Fire hydrants in the middle of sidewalks.

c.) Other Input on Engagement:

- Cheryl Bennett and April Wick offered to provide additional contact information for NorCal Deaf Association.
- The online survey should be made to be fully accessible.
- The web map could have had boxes to be able to be more accessible.
- Alta has an interactive survey, but it needs to be tested by screen readers.

- DAC/ECOS/DOT did a walk evaluation 15 years ago on Sierra Boulevard from Howe to Watt Avenue that could be useful.
- Gene Lozano can find a volunteer to test for screen readability.

City of Citrus Heights – October 13, 2020:

Attendees:

- 4 people participated via virtual Zoom meeting.
- Casey Kempenaar, City of Citrus Heights.
- Leslie Blomquist, City of Citrus Heights.
- Rick Carter, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Input Received:

- West Arcade Trail – Creek Corridor Feasibility Study is coming up. Orangevale Recreation and Park will be participating. The alternate scenario is for the trail not to go through the County and to instead, follow the County line.
- Electric Green way stops at Wachtell just south of Titalo Way.
- Discussed the four agency multi- connector feasibility study. City will pursue a grant for a feasibility study with a County local match.
- Emails sent prior to the meeting coordinating on bikeways and walkways, including a detailed description of the four agency multi-connector feasibility study, are attached.

Sacramento County Disability Advisory Commission – Physical Access Subcommittee – November 17, 2020:

Attendees:

- Members Present: Gene Lozano, Chair; Bill Fallai, Patty Gainer, Scott Harger, Randy Hicks, Carol Moss, LaTasha Richardson, Jeff Tardaguila.
- Members Absent: None.
- Guests: Mikki McDaniel, Department of Transportation.
- Staff: Cori Stillson and Cheryl Bennett, Disability Compliance Office (DCO).

Update – Active Transportation Plan (ATP):

Mikki McDaniel provided an overview of the ATP Public Engagement process, which included 30 stakeholder groups. She summarized the community input obtained through public meetings and surveys. It was noted that there were many comments from the community at large that were similar to those provided by the Subcommittee. Some common themes were speed enforcement, path of travel to public transit, bike parking, street cleaning, connection to services, and sidewalk continuity. Members discussed and debated various access barriers often encountered with shared bike/pedestrian spaces and shared experiences with specific local intersections or neighborhoods. Ms. McDaniel thanked the Subcommittee for their input and pledged to return with further updates in Spring 2021.

Sacramento County Disability Advisory Commission – Physical Access Subcommittee – December 15, 2020:

Attendees:

26 people participated.

- Members Present: Gene Lozano, Chair; Bill Fallai, Patty Gainer, Scott Harger, Randy Hicks, Carol Moss, LaTasha Richardson, Jeff Tardaguila.

- Members Absent: None.
- Guests Mikki McDaniel, Department of Transportation.
- Staff: Cori Stillson and Cheryl Bennett, Disability Compliance Office (DCO).

Staff provided an update on public engagement so far for the Active Transportation Plan update.

Mikki McDaniel provided an overview of the ATP Public Engagement process which included 30 stakeholder groups. She summarized the community input obtained through public meetings and surveys. It was noted that there were many comments from the community at large that were similar to those provided by the Subcommittee. Some common themes were speed enforcement, path of travel to public transit, bike parking, street cleaning, connection to services, and sidewalk continuity. Members discussed and debated various access barriers often encountered with shared bike/pedestrian spaces and shared experiences with specific local intersections or neighborhoods. Ms. McDaniel thanked the Subcommittee for their input and pledged to return with further updates in Spring 2021.

Input Received:

Does the County have a policy on Class 4 bikeways? Can emergency vehicles and paratransit vehicles still load and unload passengers curbside where there are Class 4 bike facilities?

The County needs a policy on Class 4 bikeways. There should be a policy in place the specifically allows loading and unloading of passengers for emergency vehicles and paratransit vehicles, regardless of other motor vehicle prohibition, within a Class 4 bikeway.

Arden-Arcade/International Rescue Committee – December 29, 2020:

Attendees:

3 project staff, 3 project partners, and 11 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom. The meeting was conducted in both English and Farsi.

- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Molly Wagner, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Margeaux Fischer, IRC.
- Yassaman Vedad, IRC.
- Chali Temple, IRC.
- 11 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Prioritize safe routes to parks, especially for young families.
- Prioritize safety of women and young children.
- Educational programming catered towards new immigrants to the U.S. that focuses on pedestrian and cyclist safety and bicycle maintenance.
- Increase overall engagement with immigrant communities.

b.) Challenges:

- Many people are walking less than before due to Covid-related health and safety concerns.
- Recent immigrants to the United States find it challenging to understand or learn pedestrian etiquette and safety.
- Missing sidewalk segments, lack of lighting, and fast-moving traffic create an unwelcoming and unsafe environment for pedestrians and cyclists.

- Long distances to popular destinations make walking and biking unrealistic, especially for young families.
- Allowing children to play in the street is a cultural norm in the Afghan community, however, American drivers do not expect this, making it dangerous for both drivers and young pedestrians.

c.) Opportunities:

- Culturally sensitive educational programs and campaigns related to pedestrian and cyclist safety for walkers, bikers, and drivers.
- Partnerships with bike advocacy organizations to organize and provide classes for those who wish to learn more about cycling, including how to ride a bike and bike maintenance.
- Wayfinding available in multiple languages to help a wider variety of people feel more confident and safe when travelling to their destination.
- Infrastructure improvements, such as wider sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes, to encourage walking, biking, and rolling.
- Improving connections between transit and cyclist and pedestrian networks.

South Sacramento – January 14, 2021:

Attendees:

4 project staff, 3 project partners, and 21 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom. The meeting was conducted in both English and Spanish.

- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Anne Okafor, WALKSacramento.
- Nahdxyeli Valdez, La Familia.

- Marissa Reyes, La Familia.
- Maria Cruz, La Familia.
- 21 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- "Comfort" means feeling safe and secure and being able to move freely wherever people want to go.
- "Safety" means:
    1. A lack of danger and being able to do things without getting hurt.
    2. Having no risk when exercising or walking. Not having to be on your guard to avoid hazards.
    3. No loose aggressive dogs.
    4. Barriers to protect from automobiles and not having to worry about a car hitting you when crossing the street.
    5. Good lighting and enough foot traffic to prevent crime.
- Favorite forms of active transportation include walking, biking, and scootering. People often use active transportation to get to transit as well.
- Favorite destinations for active transportation include schools and parks. Specific destinations include:
    1. Old Sacramento (favorite way to get there is to go under the pedestrian bridge and out to the river trail).
    2. Walking and biking in the delta.
    3. Shasta Park and Echo Park in Elk Grove.
- Prior to the pandemic, people used to walk, bike, or roll between 3-5 times per week, primarily for work and to drop off/pick up students from school. During the pandemic, people are using active transportation less because of shelter in place.
- Generally, active transportation is seen as a great way to relieve stress, interact with friends and neighbors, and go out to places like parks.

b.) Challenges:

- Places are far away.
- Biking is a lot of work.
- Hot and rainy weather discourages active travel.
- Health and safety concerns during the pandemic.
- Traffic safety – cars don't respect pedestrians.
- Personal safety – usually people in the neighborhood are friendly but sometimes they aren't.
- Lack of lighting, especially in the evening when the chance of being hit by a car increases.
- Lack of curb cuts and smooth sidewalks.
- Bike lanes often don't feel safe because they are narrow and have debris such as broken glass. One participant shared that biking is her only method of transportation to work, and broken glass in the bike Lane creates concerns about popped tires. Additionally, because bike lanes are narrow and close to fast traffic, many people use the sidewalks instead. However, sidewalks also tend to be bumpy and create an uncomfortable ride.

Sacramento County Agencies – September 22, 2021:

Attendees:

Four people participated in a virtual focus group conversation through Zoom.

- Victoria Cacciatore, SACOG.
- Tim Choi, Sac County Department of Human Assistance.
- Cheryl Bennett, representing the Disability Compliance Office and Disability Advisory Commission.
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Molly Wagner, WALKSacramento.
- Mikki McDaniel, SacDOT.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Make sure that an ATP fits in with the context and supports other initiatives. Look at where people go within a two-week period.
- Access to jobs and job interviews.
- Provide bikes for people and linking them to major volunteer or service provider destinations.
- Safe crossings for people using mobility devices that includes clear marking, ramp, no dedicated turn lanes, straight not diagonal crossing, and longer walk times.
- Think about families and their use of sidewalks and refuge islands.

b.) Challenges:

- Continuous access is really difficult in the county for medical services.
- Service delivery model for assistance does no good if people can't access healthy foods or farmers markets.
- People aren't able to get to the places they need to go to.
- Unsafe crossings.
- Bicycles sharing space with pedestrians is a danger to people with disabilities or impairments.
- More uniform bike lane design.
- Prioritize bicycling as transportation; or identify streets as either bike friendly or not.
- Really wide intersections.
- Specific locations of concern:
    1. Stockton Blvd and Florin Road are dangerous for walking and biking.
    2. Long stretches between crossings in north areas.
    3. Bell and Arden: crossings to school.

c.) Opportunities:

- Work with Black Child Legacy Campaign, WIC, and other clusters of services.
- BCLC would be great for spreading the survey.
- Pop-up projects.
- SACOG TOD toolkit has transit stations in Sac County that would be useful to examine in how it could support initiatives. Butterfield station has been identified for short-term opportunities.

Foothill Ranch Middle School – November 4, 2020:

Attendees:

19 people participated in a virtual focus group conversation through Zoom, including 10 Foothill Ranch students, 5 after-school program staff, and 4 project team members.

Project Team:

- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Molly Wagner, WALKSacramento.
- Anne Okafor, WALKSacramento.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Benefits to walking, biking, and rolling:
  - See and meet people.
  - Good for exercise and health.
  - Less pollution in the air.
  - Helps clear the mind.
  - Not everyone has a car.

b.) Challenges:

- Personal safety is a concern when walking in the neighborhood.
- Lack of lighting, narrow sidewalks, and litter create an uncomfortable walking experience.
- Specific areas of concern:
    1. Hillsdale Boulevard has a lot of fast traffic that makes it feel unsafe for walking and biking.
    2. Cars drive fast along Diablo Drive and do not yield to pedestrians trying to cross.
    3. Locations that were specified as walking and biking destinations included Robert Frost Park, La Superior Mercado, and Dollar General.

c.) Opportunities:

- Students often use active transportation to go to parks, stores, and restaurants. Connectivity to these locations is critical.
- Want to have more greenery in the neighborhood and along routes.

Fern Bacon Middle School – November 2, 2020:

Attendees:

17 people participated in a virtual focus group conversation through Zoom.

Fern Bacon Middle School Staff:

- Monica Ramos.

Project Team:

- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Frequent destinations that students mentioned travelling to included parks, the Splash Aquarium, convenient stores, and friends' houses. Access to these locations should be prioritized, with special attention to youth safety and comfort.
- Walking, running, and biking were expressed as preferred active transportation methods.

b.) Challenges:

- Streets adjacent to Fern Bacon Middle School appear to be hot spots for vehicular and pedestrian accidents. Several students reported being personally involved in crashes or knowing friends and family who had been involved in crashes along Franklin Boulevard and Florin Road.
- Longer distances to certain destinations was mentioned as an obstacle to using various modes of active transportation more frequently.
- Poorly maintained roads caused issues for bicycle maintenance (i.e., popped tires), placing cost burdens for repairs on youth.
- Specific areas of concern:
  - Florin Road (especially near where the Light Rail intersects with Florin).
  - Franklin Boulevard (especially in front of Bowling Green Elementary School).

c.) Opportunities:

- Providing more shade (i.e., street trees) along popular routes could encourage students to walk more frequently, especially during hotter times of the year.

- Adding traffic calming and/or enforcement measures, such as traffic light cameras, offer opportunities to promote safety for students and families around Fern Bacon Middle School.

Aging Adults – AARP – December 3, 2020:

Attendees:

4 project staff, 1 project partner, and 22 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom.

- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Anne Okafor, WALKSacramento.
- Jennifer Berdugo, AARP.
- 22 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Prioritize infrastructure that helps reduce speeds in and around residential neighborhoods.
- Prioritize safe routes to parks, trails and essential destinations.
- Prioritize safety of aging populations and persons with disabilities who may use walkers and wheelchairs.
- Prioritize improvements in all areas particularly outside of the midtown and the downtown core.

b.) Challenges:

- When biking and walking there are a lot of blind spots that make it dangerous.

- Wet leaves in dedicated bike lanes make it unsafe for bicyclists.
- Bike Lane widths are not wide enough, are incomplete or simply do not exist.
- Biking and walking is not always safe, especially at night and current infrastructure doesn't support walking and biking.
- Wheelchair ramps are broken, inconsistent and worn out.
- Without sidewalks, using a walker is difficult and unsafe.

c.) Opportunities:

- Infrastructure improvements, especially around visibility and wayfinding.
- Prioritize infrastructure improvements like wider sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes, to encourage walking, biking, and rolling in areas that currently prioritize vehicles.
- Utilize Barcodes or QR codes where you can click and access maps.

Disability – Resources for Independent Living – October 23, 2020:

Attendees:

8 people participated in a virtual focus group conversation through Zoom.

- Nicholas Lanphear, Resources for Independent Living.
- April Wick, Resources for Independent Living.
- Tony Vi, Resources for Independent Living.
- Kaelea Luca, Resources for Independent Living.
- Angelina Guerrero, Resources for Independent Living.
- Helen O'Connell, Resources for Independent Living.
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Prioritize access to the following locations by increasing connectivity between pedestrian, bus, light rail, and cyclist networks: grocery stores, hospitals/medical offices, schools, and job centers.
- Improve access to outdoor recreational opportunities, particularly trails and parks, by consistently providing 110 outlets for those who use electrically powered mobility devices.

b.) Challenges:

- COVID-19 Challenges:
  - Bikeshare (Jump Bikes) was not available for a period of time during the pandemic.
- Poorly maintained sidewalks and roads make cycling, walking, and rolling dangerous, especially along busy roadways.
- Many bus stops do not have elevated sidewalks, which increases the incline of the wheelchair ramp from the bus to the street and creates unsafe conditions for wheelchair users.
- There is a disconnect between job centers and public transportation/ active transportation networks (i.e., jobs in the food service industry in Natomas difficult to access without a car).
- Specific areas of concern:
  1. Along Jackson Road: no sidewalk— dangerous for walking.
  2. Between Sacramento City College and Hiram Johnson High School: unmaintained, narrow dedicated bike Lane shared with parked cars, runs parallel to busy roadway, aggressive drivers— dangerous for cycling.
  3. Harlin Drive around the Applied Behavior Consultants (ABC) School: no sidewalks or bus stops– dangerous for walking, difficult to access.

4. Between Power Inn and Rancho Cordova: no sidewalks—dangerous for walking.
5. 14th Avenue from Sutter to 65th Street: Narrow road with busy traffic, unprotected bike Lane – dangerous for cycling.
6. Florin Road: sidewalk gaps, difficult surfaces (i.e., gravel) to walk on – dangerous for walking, rolling, biking.
7. 47th Avenue: There are sidewalk gaps that prevent access to bus stops.
8. Thornhill Drive: no bicycle facilities, dangerous for cycling (especially at night).

c.) Opportunities:

- Think creatively about promoting access to alternatives of key destinations. For instance, emphasizing access to local farmers' markets can improve access to healthy food for those who are located further away from grocery stores.
- Connecting active transportation networks to public transportation networks, particularly addressing first/last mile gaps to light rail stations and bus stops, was identified as a priority. Micro mobility modes (i.e., bike share and scooters) appear to be frequently used to access transit.

Greater Sacramento Area Park Managers Meeting – March 18, 2020:

Attendees:

3 people and 1 County staff person participated via virtual Zoom meeting. (Not all participant names were recorded.)

- Liz Bellas, Sacramento County Regional Parks.
- Mike Heller, Rio Linda Elverta Parks.
- Cristina James, Cordova Recreation and Parks.

- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Staff presented on the Active Transportation Plan schedule, outreach, and analysis. Some key points from the analysis include:

- Concurrent with outreach, our consulting team, Alta and DKS Associates, have been performing analysis to figure out where we need to improve bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Their analysis includes origin/destination, safety, equity, and level of stress.
- The bicycle network is inconsistent across the County. Some communities have dense networks and other areas have few facilities.
- There are limited regional connections between incorporated and unincorporated County.
- Many trips less than 5 miles occur in the northern part of the County. Most areas of the County are projected to see some increases in walking and biking trips.
- Access to light rail is key because most current and future jobs will be located along light rail lines.
- The highest concentrations of population growth are expected to occur within the master plan areas.
- 55 miles of roadway (6.5% of unincorporated roads) compose the high-injury network.
- Many designated bikeways are high-stress for people biking. Most arterial and collector streets are also high-stress for people walking.

Staff discussed how the plan can help Sacramento Area parks for their districts' projects. Invited park districts to the May workshops.

Input Received:

- No input received.

City of Elk Grove – February 8, 2020:

Attendees:

3 people participated via virtual Zoom meeting:

- Kevin Bewsey, City of Elk Grove.
- Carrie Whitlock, City of Elk Grove.
- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.

Input Received:

Discussed Elk Grove-unincorporated County bike and ped issues, including:

- Laguna Creek Trail has several alignments west of Franklin Boulevard and south of Cosumnes River Boulevard, depending of whose plan you are looking for between the City of Elk Grove, City of Sacramento, and County of Sacramento. The City of Elk Grove has a grant to look at this and do more planning.
- Overlap in planning with different proposed facilities for Grant Line Road and Kammerer Road.
- Class 1, 2, 3 connections across Calvine Road and considering EGUSD boundaries do not align with City Limits.
- Consider adding a priority to the County's plan, to inform Elk Grove planning efforts.

County requested GIS or a map for Laguna Creek Trail that Elk Grove is using, and any proposed connections across Calvine Road.

Meeting Follow-up:

Mikki McDaniel sent the City the adopted Ped and Bicycle Master Plan GIS for the County as well as responses below on February 10, 2021.

- Laguna Creek Trail alignment – County adopted BMP (pdf) show an existing Class 2 along Franklin and proposed Class 2 along Cosumnes River Blvd west of Franklin in the pdf of the plan.

- Crossings over Calvine Road proposed in County adopted Bicycle Master Plan include a Class 1 crossing in between the high schools east of Kingsbridge; and another Class 1 crossing along UPRR.
- County mapping shows a proposed Class 2 on Kammerer from Bruceville to Grant Line/Cosumnes River Blvd.

Health Organizations – September 22, 2021:

Attendees:

6 people participated in a virtual focus group conversation through Zoom.

- Stacy Springer, Breathe CA.
- Misael Chavarin, UC Davis Trauma Prevention Center.
- Roxana Garcia-Ochoa, Health Education Council (HEC).
- Monica Alleje, American Heart Association (AHA).
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Molly Wagner, WALKSacramento.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Need to consider first and last mile connections between various modes.
- A Complete Streets policy would be valuable in order to ensure a holistic approach to transportation and access.
- Signage and wayfinding are important amenities to provide connectivity to trails and safe pedestrian and bicycle routes.
- Lighting is critical for personal safety.
- Shading for trails and streets improves comfort as well when walking and biking.
- Breathe sees potential for the Plan to help improve air quality through reduced VMT.

- UCD is interested in seeing if there has been a spike in pedestrian and bicycle injuries in recent years, and is particularly interested in analyzing injury data trends around e-bikes and scooters.

b.) Challenges:

- COVID-19 challenges:
    1. It has been challenging to successfully engage with people on-the-ground. Programs such as Breathe's Community Carshare and HEC's Walk With Friends program have been heavily impacted because of the need to meet face-to-face with residents.
    2. There is a lot of Zoom fatigue, and not everyone wants to be on Zoom calls.
    3. Programs and services have pivoted away from big events and shifted to virtual settings.
- Access to daily destinations is a big barrier for a lot of people, particularly to grocery stores and meal pick-ups. Students who don't have reliable transportation face challenges in picking up meals at school sites, which are more set up for vehicle pick-up.
- Lack of continuous sidewalks and crosswalks.
- Outside of the Sacramento downtown core, there are fewer bike lanes and people tend to bike on the sidewalk. People also often don't wear helmets.
- Shared active transportation spaces (especially with e-bikes and scooters) can lead to crashes and unsafe conditions between pedestrians and bikes.
- Specific areas of concern:
    1. American River access on Watt Avenue: one side of the river is well lit and maintained, while the other side is not and feels more unsafe.
    2. American River access at Discovery Park: lots of personal safety concerns with people experiencing homelessness on the trail.

c.) Opportunities:

- Short videos have been effective for AHA in promoting messaging around health. Rather than having Zoom meetings to educate people, it could be useful to provide short videos on social media and schedule virtual meetings for direct feedback as needed.
- Work with elected official districts to get the word out about community events.
- HEC works closely with the Twin Rivers Unified School District in North Sacramento and can support sharing information about the survey and workshops.

Phase 1 Workshop Summaries — November 10, 2020:

Attendees:

Project Team Staff:

- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Otto Melara, Alta Planning.
- Libby Nachman, Alta Planning.
- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Molly Wagner, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Anne Okafor, WALKSacramento.
- Julissa Rocha, Languages 4 You.

Afternoon Session 12:00 – 1:30pm:

- Zoom: 48 participants, including 9 project team staff.
- Facebook Live: 15 participants.

Evening Session 6:00—7:30pm:

- Zoom: 28 participants, including 9 project team staff.
- Facebook: 14 participants.

Workshop Summary:

- Two workshops were held on Tuesday, November 10th for the Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan. The goal of the workshops were to increase awareness of the Active Transportation Plan, understand overarching concerns for walking, biking, and rolling, and understand location-specific challenges and opportunities. The workshops began with a presentation about the Active Transportation Plan, with online polls and question and answer interspersed throughout. Simultaneous Spanish translation was provided for both of the workshops.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Improving safety and improving access to destinations were the top-rated priorities for both the afternoon and evening workshops.
- Improve safety for everyone, especially people walking and bicycling.
- Develop more connected bicycle and sidewalk networks.
- Increase access to parks, schools, and other community destinations.
- Make walking and bicycling more comfortable.
- Improving access and connections is the foundation of a safe transportation network.
- Educate bike riders to ride in the same direction as auto traffic.
- Educate drivers about being more aware of people walking, biking, and rolling.
- Increase signage on bike trials and roads.
- Reduce speed limits through design, such as reducing vehicle Lane widths and eliminating one-way streets.

- Be mindful of the needs of cane users and people with mobility, vision, and hearing disabilities.
- Transportation issues must be intersectional and center the voices and experiences of BIPOC.
- Create safer connectivity to transit.

b.) Challenges:

- Residents generally don't feel safe biking, walking and rolling.
- If bikes and pedestrians don't have alternate connection options, they get funneled into the same transportation corridors with cars, which is inherently less safe.
- As far as sidewalk maintenance goes, many miles of sidewalks are hazardous for pedestrians and wheelchair users.
- Bikers tend to ride against traffic, which is more dangerous than riding with traffic. With the proper infrastructure, this could make biking with traffic feel safer.
- There are a lot of freeway off/on ramps in this community that can create obstacles for folks walking and biking.
- Specific areas of concern:
    1. More all-way stop signs and crosswalks leading to river trails, especially at Maine Avenue, Dredger, and Winding Oak.
    2. Need more buffered bike lanes on busy streets, such as Franklin Boulevard in Elk Grove.
    3. Missing sidewalk segments on Marconi between Ashbourne and Morse.
    4. There is not a safe way to cross from Fair Oaks onto Morse without going against traffic, which is very dangerous.
    5. Carmichael has several street arteries with minimal sidewalks and utility poles that make it difficult to walk and bike.

6. Jackson Highway has little or no shoulder for biking making it dangerous for bikers and also frustrating for motorists trying to pass. Widening the road to make space for bicyclists is ideal.
7. Frontage streets, such as along the south side of El Camino Avenue between Bell and Howe, are dangerous and difficult for pedestrians to maneuver.

c.) Opportunities:

- Data and policy opportunities:
    1. Look into the county's ADA transition plan recommendations for inclusion into the ATP.
    2. Get involved in the Caltrans Active Transportation Plan for District 3 to coordinate around freeway ramps and overpasses.
    3. Use data sources such as Strava Metro and other Mobility Crowd Sources to capture a larger audience of where people are biking, and to see what connections would be most useful.
    4. Map pedestrian and bicycle injuries and related citations for the County.
    5. Prioritize funding for pedestrian and bicycle projects.
    6. Coordinate with city plans, such as City of Sacramento.
    7. Work with utility agencies to underground utilities.
- Design opportunities:
    1. Put up speed limit signs at closer intervals to improve driver awareness and enforceability.
    2. More arrows indicating correct walking and biking directions on trails.
- Outreach opportunities:
    1. Engage with schools, parent groups, business districts, climate change and biking organizations (SABA, 350 Sac, Sacramento Bicycle Kitchen, Bicycle Advocates of Rancho Cordova, etc.), college and high school students, senior living communities, and faith communities.

2. Utilize Next Door, apartment complex newsletters, and other local communication networks.
3. Conduct intercept interviews at grocery stores, transit stops, and farmers markets.
4. Coordinate with utility districts and SacRT to share information.
5. Put informational signage at dangerous intersections.
6. Ensure that the online map is in a mobile-friendly format.

d.) Key Questions from Attendees:

- Data:
    1. Are there data (police) available to study and to think about possible improvement recommendations?
    2. Is there any comprehensive data, for Sacramento County, on walkability, sidewalk conditions, bike lanes, or pathways for no vehicle transportation?
    3. Have the bike/ped injuries and related citations been mapped for our county?
    4. Where do we find the results of your current assessment of existing conditions?
- Safety + Security:
    1. Are there any measures to reduce vehicle speed on residential streets (i.e. traffic calming)?
    2. I had yet another bike (with a good lock) stolen this year from a secure location. This is a serious problem in our area. What can we do about it as part of this plan?
    3. Are there any plans in place for better street cleaning to reduce impacts on cyclists?
    4. How do you plan on keeping people safe who are not in cars?
    5. How does the plan address improvements that intend to make women feel more comfortable and encouraged to ride?

6. What does “comfortable” mean?

- Plan + Process:
    1. What influence do we have upon our desires?
    2. What are the long-term strategies for maintaining any new infrastructure as well as the old?
    3. Are there any education and outreach programs to elementary schools promoting bike to school and walk to school?
    4. How does the county's plan mesh with the work being done in some of our cities (e.g., the City of Sacramento)?
    5. I understand that County is considering joining the Age Friendly Network. Will you build in those considerations into the plan?
- System Connectivity:
    1. How soon can we connect all schools with bike lanes, especially in regards to crossing Arden and Alta Arden?
    2. What is being done regionally to connect individual city bike trail systems?
    3. Is there a chance Sacramento will be home to more bike boulevards, especially through downtown/ midtown?
    4. What is Sacramento County doing in regards to electric vehicles?
    5. I don't quite understand "connect bike lanes and sidewalks." Does this mean connecting them to each other? Improving the bike network?
    6. What is your definition of “human powered” transportation? Does this include electric bicycles, electric scooters, electric skateboards, etc.?
- Funding:
    1. How would the plan be funded and what is the process for building the solutions identified in an active transportation plan?
    2. About sidewalk maintenance, many miles of sidewalks are hazardous for pedestrians and wheelchair users. What party is responsible and is there funding for improving sidewalks?
- Infrastructure:

1. As a bike commuter, are there plans to install more bike friendly 'trigger' buttons at stoplights?
2. How will ongoing maintenance concerns be addressed in the plan? (e.g. repairing curbs, cleaning up glass on sidewalks or bike lanes, etc.)
3. Are green bike lanes cost prohibitive? Would be awesome if every bike lane was painted green.

A screenshot of the participants of the first virtual workshop is included here.

Next is a screenshot of a poll from the Fall Workshop Afternoon Session (Held on 11/20/2020 with 49 respondents). The poll reads, “Which of the following goals are most important to you? (Choose your top 2)”. The results are as follows:

Improve Safety: 37%.

Connect bike lanes and sidewalks: 16%.

Improve access to destinations: 29%.

Make walking & bicycling more comfortable: 12%.

Other: Please share in the chat!: 6%.

Another set of results from the same poll is included, though taken from a different meeting—Fall Workshop Evening Session (Held on 11/20/2020 with 13 respondents). The results are listed below:

Improve Safety: 32%.

Connect bike lanes and sidewalks: 14%.

Improve access to destinations: 36%.

Make walking & bicycling more comfortable: 14%.

Other: Please share in the chat!: 4%.

POP-UP EVENTS:

SACOG Youth Leadership Academy– May 15, 2021:

Attendees:

2 project staff, 2 project partners, and 25 students participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom.

- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Rosie Ramos, SACOG.
- Jazmin Luna, Pro Youth and Families.
- 25 students.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- When participating in the “dream street” activity, students shared that their ideal streets included lots of shade and vegetation, community gardens, wide walking paths separated from cyclists, more bike lanes, and better access to entertainment.
- Popular destinations that students walk or bike to included school, friends’ houses, local cafes and parks, markets, and work, and around the neighborhood.

- Safety and equity were the top two factors students indicated for prioritizing pedestrian and cyclist improvements. Several students shared their concerns and observations related to unequitable distribution of active transportation facilities throughout the county, such as the disparities between Elk Grove and South Sacramento.

b.) Challenges

- Time, distance, personal safety, sidewalk gaps, unmarked crossings, uneven or unmaintained pavement, and lack of lighting were major barriers when walking or biking for students.
- Bus stop siting was identified as another challenge. Students reported bus stops in their neighborhood being located at busy intersections with minimal-to-no crossing facilities, making it unsafe to access transit by foot or bike.
- At busy intersections with unmarked crossings, students reported frequently observing people running into the street to use center turn lanes as median refuge islands, resulting in several near-misses.

c.) Opportunities

- Overall, sidewalks and crosswalks were students' top priorities for pedestrian improvements. For bicycling improvements, students preferred shared-use paths and buffered bike lanes because they provide the highest degree of separation between cyclists and cars.
- Students had concerns related to Class 2 bike lanes because of the minimal separation between cyclists and drivers. They also frequently observed parked cars occupying the Class 2 bike lanes in their neighborhoods.
- In terms of pedestrian improvements, students had concerns about median refuge islands because they thought refuge islands might encourage people to run into traffic as they currently observe people doing. Thus, students recommended median refuge islands be paired with crosswalks and other

pedestrian facilities to promote safety and discourage dangerous crossing behavior.

- Future opportunities to engage SACOG's YLA students should be explored in future project phases as the group provides a critical youth perspective and already possess background knowledge on planning and active transportation.

Shown here are kids walking and biking along a sidewalk with their backpacks.

Next, results from different types of surveys are shown from the SACOG Youth Leadership Academy meeting.

In the first one, it was asked, "What priorities are most important to you?" The results are as follows:

Safety: 28%.

Equity: 22%.

Community Need: 19%.

Access: 13%.

Comfort: 10%.

Connectivity: 9%.

In the second survey, the question was, "Where do you like to walk, bike, or roll to?" The responder's answers then popped up on a word map. Some answers included: Around the neighborhood, school, park, friend's house, cafes to read, work, river.

The question in the next survey was, “Which pedestrian improvements would you like in your community?” The improvements will be listed first, followed by the number of responders that voted for it:

Sidewalks: 10.

Crosswalks: 11.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: 4.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon: 7.

Curb Extensions: 5.

Leading Pedestrian Interval: 0.

Median Refuge Island: 3.

Slip Lane Removal: 0.

No Right on Red: 2.

Other: 0.

The next survey reads, “Which bicycle improvements would you like in your community?” Again, improvements will be listed first, followed by the number of votes accrued.

Class 1: Shared-Use Path: 6.

Class 2: Bike Lane: 5.

Class 2B: Buffered Bike Lane: 8.

Class 3: Bike Boulevard: 1.

Class 4: Separated Bikeway: 3.

Other: 0.

The last survey asks, “Which pedestrian improvements do you NOT like?” The votes are as follows:

Sidewalks: 0.

Crosswalks: 0.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: 0.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon: 0.

Curb Extensions: 1.

Leading Pedestrian Interval: 0.

Median Refuge Island: 5.

Slip Lane Removal: 2.

No Right on Red: 5.

Other: 0.

Vineyard Bicycle Tune-up – May 21, 2021:

Attendees:

2 project staff, 1 project partner, and 14 community members participated in an in-person pop-up event at Don and Brenda Nottoli Park in Vineyard. The pop-up was held in conjunction with a free community bicycle tune-up hosted by the 50 Corridor Transportation Management Agency.

- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.

- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Leah Barrett, 50 Corridor Transportation Management Agency.
- 14 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Overall, participants typically liked bike infrastructure with greater separation from vehicle traffic. Participants indicated a strong preference for Class 1 shared use paths and Class 4 protected bike lanes.
- When asked about pedestrian infrastructure, participants were generally interested in improving crossings, particularly at major intersections.

b.) Challenges:

- Cars drive fast down neighborhood streets in Vineyard.
- Calvine Road and Elk Grove Florin Road is a really dangerous intersection for pedestrians to cross because there's so much traffic.
- Biking into Elk Grove from Vineyard is difficult because there are few routes, no sidewalks, and fast-moving traffic.
- One participant mentioned not being able to bike to work because there are no bike lanes or only Class 2 bike lanes, which feel unsafe for biking on.
- Protected bike lanes are difficult for drivers to navigate because they make the road more narrow.

c.) Opportunities:

- Participants indicated a need for crossing improvements and generally liked strategies such as slip-lane removal, leading pedestrian intervals and restricting right-turn movements on red lights, and rectangular flashing rapid beacons.

- Participants liked bike boulevards as a way to slow down cars in the neighborhood to make it safer for biking.
- Participants liked the proposed Class 4 protected bike lanes for Howe Avenue, Watt Avenue, and other similarly busy roads.
- Participants generally liked shared-use paths because they are completely separated from cars, although there were some concerns with pedestrian and bicycle conflicts.
- Participants generally liked the proposed buffered and protected bikes lanes in North Vineyard, specifically the proposed buffered bike Lane on Bradshaw.
- Participants asked whether bike bridges would be included in the Plan and indicated a desire for a bridge over the American River Trail near the Watt Avenue access point in order to get from the south side to the north side.

Sacramento Native American Health Center – May 17, 2021:

Attendees:

2 project staff and 3 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom.

- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- 3 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- As part of the “Dream Street” activity, participants shared that their ideal streets were streets where children could safely and comfortably play, featuring wide sidewalks, traffic calming elements, and lots of shade. Participants also emphasized the desire for community spaces, edible

plantings, and mixed-use development that makes it easy to access destinations by foot or bike.

- Participants' top priorities for active transportation improvements were safety and implementation. Participants shared their experiences and observations related to long-term disinvestment from pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure in their neighborhoods as compared to higher income areas in the county. Thus, participants were eager to see improvements in their community as soon as possible.

b.) Challenges:

- Parents do not feel comfortable allowing their children walk or bike alone due to concerns related to personal safety and inadequate active transportation infrastructure.
- Participants felt that their communities have largely been left out of city or county-led planning efforts and, thus were somewhat skeptical of the Plan's goals to bring improvements to their neighborhoods.
- Sidewalk gaps, personal safety, and fast-moving traffic are major obstacles participants face when walking, biking, and rolling in the county. Specific areas of concern included:
    1. Fast moving traffic, sidewalk gaps, and homeless encampments along Lemon Hill Avenue.
    2. Sidewalk gaps along 65th Street.
    3. Major homeless encampments and reported sex work south of Stockton Boulevard and Lawrence Drive.

c.) Opportunities:

- Participants felt that their community would benefit from education campaigns for drivers, pedestrians, and cyclists alike to raise awareness for road safety.
- One participant is an active member of the Indigenous community in Sacramento and has direct connections to the annual Powwow, which could provide future opportunities to better engage Native-identifying residents.

- Another participant has connections to the Hmong/Lao Community Center along Lemon Hill Avenue, which could provide future opportunities to better engage the Hmong and Lao communities in Sacramento.
- Overall, participants liked all of the proposed pedestrian infrastructure improvements, particularly crosswalks, sidewalks, Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, and lighting.
- Participants preferred cyclist improvements that afforded the highest degree of protection or separation from cars, such as the buffered bike lanes and separated bikeways. However, one participant had concerns related to the parking and buffered bike lanes due to potential conflict between cyclists and cars.

Two sets of survey results are included from the Native American Heath Center Event. The first asks, “What priorities are most important to you?” The breakdown of votes is as follows:

Equity: 38%.

Implementation: 29%.

Safety: 25%.

Connectivity: 8%.

The second asks, “Which pedestrian improvements would you like in your community?” The improvement options are listed, followed by number of votes:

Sidewalks: 3.

Curb Ramps: 2.

Curb Extensions: 1.

Crosswalks: 3.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: 3.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon: 1.

Median Refuge Island: 2.

Lighting: 3.

Other: 0.

Resources for Independent Living – April 28, 2021:

Attendees:

2 project staff, 1 project partner, and 3 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom.

- Molly Wagner, WALKSacramento.
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- April Wick, Resources for Independent Living.
- 3 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Make sure people with disabilities are fully integrated into the community and have the choices to get where they need to go or do what they want to do.
- Participants' "dream streets" included:
    1. More greenery.
    2. Protected bike lanes and crosswalks (such as pedestrian hybrid beacons).
    3. Pedestrian-scale lighting.

4. Sidewalks that are wide enough to accommodate restaurant seating as well as people using wheelchairs.
5. Cane lanes that provide a tactical strip for canes to follow, particularly for winding trails.
6. Integration of audible intros for storefronts to provide information on what the store is.
7. Tactile crossing indicators, which can provide benefits to both blind and low vision and deaf and hard of hearing pedestrians.

b.) Challenges:

- Audible signals are not integrated consistently and often get rejected due to noise complaints from neighboring residents.
- Drivers do not yield and tend to cut pedestrians off in the middle of the street while crossing. One particular location where this consistently occurs is Florin and Amherst.
- Audible signals and push buttons are often not ADA accessible. Push buttons for different crosswalks will be located on the same pole, when they should be located parallel to the crossing so that people who are blind can walk up and align themselves to the crosswalk. Additionally, push buttons may be set back far from the curb where people using wheelchairs or mobility devices cannot reach them.
    - An intersection where this challenge occurs is Fruitridge and Freeport. One participant mentioned that she does not cross here out of fear of being hit, although several of her students cross here to access the bus to get to community college. While this particular intersection is located in the City of Sacramento, proper push button alignment and ADA compliance should also be a priority for County intersections.

c.) Opportunities:

- While buffered and separated bikeways along arterial streets are valuable for improving safety, project implementation should also be balanced with cost-

effectiveness. Existing neighborhood streets may already provide safe alternative routes to arterials.

- Many people use Google Maps when planning bike routes, but it isn't always up-to-date with new bike infrastructure. Will this be coordinated with map companies in the future to update?
- Does the County have ADA standards for placement of push buttons at intersections? If not, some standards and guidance should be incorporated in this plan. As an example, push buttons should always be located parallel to the crossing that they are connected to.
- Some recommended improvements to crossings, particularly for people who are blind and low vision, include:
    1. Tactile signals rather than audible signals to indicate when it is safe to cross. There is an assumption that if you are blind you can hear really well, but that is just not the case. This type of signal is also better for people who are deaf and hard of hearing, as well as for quieter neighborhoods.
    2. In San Francisco, there is an intersection with a lever that vibrates when the walk sign is on in addition to an audible signal.
    3. The UK has one of the best crossings for people who are blind and low vision – there is a plate in braille that tells the name of the intersection and a cone that spins when it's safe to cross.
- RRFBs and Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons may be challenging for people who are blind and low vision. Because cars may not yield, is there a way know when it is safe to cross?
    - More education and outreach to blindness organizations about these types of crossings may be needed for people to become familiar with this infrastructure.
- Trails for people who are blind and low vision:
    1. There needs to be a better way for people who are blind or low vision to access call boxes on trails, potentially adding an audible message or geomarker for people to locate them via phone.

2. Geomarkers for trail entrances and exits are also important to know where you are and where you can get on or off the trail. Because there are no labeled or audible intersections like on a street network, it can be difficult to know how far you've gone and where you're at.

South Sacramento La Familia – May 26, 2021:

Attendees:

3 project staff, 2 project partners, and 5 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom that was held in English and Spanish.

- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Nahdyexli Valdez, La Familia.
- Maria Perez, La Familia.
- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County.
- 5 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- As part of the "Dream Street" activity, participants shared that their ideal streets have plants and vegetation, places to ride bikes away from cars, curbs, bright green bike paths connecting to other streets (like in downtown Sacramento), trees for shade, and sidewalks that are wide, clean, and uncracked.
- Participants' top priority for project implementation was safety, followed by equity and connectivity.

b.) Challenges:

- Sidewalk gaps are a major challenge, especially around schools. One participant noted missing sidewalks in the neighborhood around Will C. Wood Middle School as being a significant safety barrier.
- Lack of tree shade and urban greening within South Sacramento neighborhoods makes walking, biking, and rolling feel uncomfortable.

c.) Opportunities:

- For pedestrian improvements, participants indicated a desire for more sidewalks (and particularly detached sidewalks with landscaped buffers), lighting, curb extensions, and crosswalks in their communities.
- For bicycle improvements, participants indicated a desire for greater separation from cars, with Class 4 separated bikeways being the highest priority. Class 1 shared use paths and Class 2b buffered bike lanes were also improvements that participants liked.
- Pedestrian and bicycle improvements that participants were less interested in or had concerns about included median refuge islands and Class 2 unbuffered bike lanes. Participants did not like Class 2 unbuffered bike lanes because they prefer greater separation from vehicles.

Survey results from the South Sacramento La Familia Event are included. A breakdown of responses to the question, “What priorities are most important to you?” is as follows:

Safety: 41%.

Equity: 22%.

Connectivity: 22%.

Implementation: 16%.

Next are votes for which pedestrian improvements participants want to see in their community:

Sidewalks: 4.

Curb Ramps: 1.

Curb Extensions: 2.

Crosswalks: 2.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: 1.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon: 1.

Median Refuge Island: 0.

Lighting: 3.

Other: 2.

West Arden Arcade/International Rescue Committee – April 20, 2021:

Attendees:

4 project staff, 3 project partners, and 13 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom that was conducted in English and Farsi.

- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Libby Nachman, Alta Planning + Design.
- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County DOT.
- Yasi Vedad, International Rescue Committee.
- Alyssa Serrano, International Rescue Committee.
- Margeaux Fischer, International Rescue Committee.
- 13 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Prioritize safety and connectivity in active transportation improvements.
- Prioritize access to parks, green space, and transit.

b.) Challenges:

- Trash and poor lighting within neighborhoods in West Arden Arcade currently contribute to lack of safety while walking and biking. In particular, the Carmichael area is very dark at night and could benefit from more pedestrian-scale lighting to encourage active transportation.
- In the neighborhood around Watt Avenue and Edison Avenue, there is a lack of parks, trails, and other public green space for walking.

c.) Opportunities:

- Overall, participants liked Class 1 and Class 4 bike lanes due to greater separation between cars and people biking. Participants also liked pedestrian median islands as a way to make crossings feel safer.
- One participant wanted to see more lighting, street decorations, and seasonal trees and vegetation along walking and biking routes, similar to the streets from her hometown in Turkey.
- Coordinate with park districts and utility districts to improve lighting along streets and at park sites.
- Consider opportunities to increase tree canopy and urban greening in conjunction with pedestrian and bicycle improvements.

Participants of the West Arden Arcade/International Rescue Committee Event were also asked about their priorities for the community. Survey results are as follows:

Safety: 48%.

Equity: 19%.

Connectivity: 18%.

Implementation: 15%.

Delta Area:

Attendees:

4 project staff, 1 project partner, and 2 community members participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom.

- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Otto Melara, Alta Planning + Design.
- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County DOT.
- Lindsey Liebeg, Sacramento County Fam Bureau.
- 2 community members.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- Improve safety and comfort for walking, biking, and rolling in cities' main streets or commercial centers, between marinas, and between cities or towns in the unincorporated Delta region.
- Provide opportunities for recreational walking, biking, and rolling.
- Prioritize safety and connectivity in active transportation improvements.

b.) Challenges:

- Given the rural nature of the unincorporated Delta region, making trips or running errands by foot or bike is difficult due to long distances between destinations.
- Little to no streets in residential or commercial areas have sidewalks. In most places, pedestrians and cyclists must share the road with fast-moving cars, large trucks, and large farming equipment (especially during harvest season) without any physical separation. In addition, the roads are very narrow in many areas, often with no shoulder or gutter, forcing pedestrians and cyclists to be in even closer proximity to vehicular traffic. Where shoulders or gutters do exist, they are often unmaintained, resulting in weed growth and uneven surfaces that make for challenging and inaccessible terrain.
- Many roads in the Delta are very windy, which decreases visibility of pedestrians and cyclists to cars and vice versa.
- Travel between cities and town, such as between Walnut Grove and Locke, is especially dangerous because the posted speed limit increases to over 40 miles per hour and there is no separation between vehicular traffic, pedestrians, and cyclists.
- The rise in navigation apps has led to an increase in cars travelling on secondary roads, such as levee roads and Highway 160, as drivers seek to bypass traffic on major highways, such as I-5. These secondary roads are not built for heavy traffic and drivers do not respect speed limits, creating unsafe conditions for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Specific areas of concern include:
    1. Levee roads in the North Delta Region (specifically in Clarksburg and Courtland).
    2. The “Delta Loop”.

c.) Opportunities:

- Biking is already a popular form of travel among Delta residents, which increases the likelihood of future cyclist improvements and treatments in the area to be well-used.
- Participants were highly interested in Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons for crossings, as well as Class 1 shared-use paths for biking. Participants indicated that advisory shoulders seemed confusing for both cyclists and drivers alike, and would not be desirable without additional signage or education.
- One participant mentioned the possibility of piloting low-cost solutions, such as providing pedestrians with high-visibility flags for crossing streets, as seen in Salt Lake City, Utah.
- There is an approximately half mile segment of River Road between Locke and Walnut Grove that is often used by people walking. Safety of pedestrians would significantly benefit from the installation of sidewalks along this segment, and would encourage more active travel between the two communities.
- Local businesses rely heavily on foot traffic. Thus, partnering with local chambers of commerce, business associations, and local business owners for future engagement efforts present opportunities to stimulate the local economy and increase public participation and buy-in.
- Even though many levee roads are officially closed to the public, they are still widely used by Delta residents for recreation, such as the patrol road that runs from Oxbow Marina to Tyler Island Bridge Road. Partnering with private property owners could potentially expand opportunities for walking, biking, and rolling in the Delta, especially for facilities completely separated from vehicular traffic.
- Open space alongside main highways and thoroughfares presents opportunities for Class 1 side paths to promote safe and comfortable travel between cities, towns, and marinas.

Foothill High – May 6, 2021:

Attendees:

2 project staff, 1 project partner, and 19 students participated in a virtual pop-up meeting through Zoom.

- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Andrea Villani, Foothill High Leadership Class Teacher.
- 19 high school students.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- When asked to share their ideal “dream street”, students indicated that they would like to have elote carts, slushies, popcorn, ice cream, an anime store, and more trees.
- Students’ favorite places to walk, bike, and roll to included parks, friends’ houses, restaurants and food stores, trails, schools, and around the block in their neighborhoods.
- Overall, students’ top priorities are for infrastructure projects that have the greatest safety, comfort, and community need.

b.) Challenges:

- Personal safety was identified as a major challenge for walking, biking, and rolling in the neighborhood, especially for women. Getting lost was also a concern.
- Heat and weather conditions was another factor for students in whether or not they feel comfortable using active transportation. A lack of shade trees in particular was highlighted as a desire to improve comfort while walking.

- Lack of sidewalks and narrow sidewalks makes walking and rolling feel unsafe due to proximity to traffic.
- Many destinations don't have safe places to lock and store bikes, skateboards, scooters, and other belongings.
- Walking along Hillsdale Boulevard feels unsafe due to narrow sidewalks and speed of traffic. When asked about the bike lanes, one student mentioned that they feel safe to bike on currently, although other students were also interested in additional buffered space from car traffic.
- Elkhorn Boulevard was highlighted as an unsafe place to walk or bike due to speed and volume of traffic. Students indicated that many people don't walk there currently.

c.) Opportunities:

- Overall, students want more separation between pedestrians, bicyclists, and cars. The types of infrastructure that they most want to see in the Foothill Farms neighborhood include crosswalks, sidewalks, and Class 2B buffered bike lanes. For crossing treatments, students were most interested in high visibility striping and leading pedestrian intervals.
- Some of the types of infrastructure improvements that students' did not like included curb extensions, median refuge islands, and Class 1 shared use paths. For curb extensions and median refuge islands, students mentioned that cars crash into them (and physical property as a result), and that drivers still tend not to yield to allow pedestrians to finish crossing. For shared use paths, students indicated that bicyclists can be aggressive and were concerned about pedestrian and bicycle conflicts.
- Other investments that students would like to see include shade trees and wayfinding.

A series of survey results are included from the Foothill High Event. Questions will be listed first, followed by the responses, and the number or percentage of votes if applicable.

“Where do you like to walk, bike, or roll to?”

Park, my friend’s place, trails, store, elementary school, taking dog on walks, the park, food, Sacramento river.

“What priorities are most important to you?”

Safety: 33%.

Comfort: 23%.

Community Need: 17%.

Equity: 11%.

Access: 10%.

Connectivity: 6%.

“Which pedestrian improvements would you like in your community?”

Sidewalks: 6.

Crosswalks: 8.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: 2.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon: 2.

Curb Extensions: 3.

Leading Pedestrian Interval: 2.

Median Refuge Island: 0.

Slip Lane Removal: 0.

No Right on Red: 2.

Other: 0.

“Which pedestrian improvements do you NOT like?”

Sidewalks: 3.

Crosswalks: 1.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: 0.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon: 0.

Curb Extensions: 5.

Leading Pedestrian Interval: 0.

Median Refuge Island: 1.

Slip Lane Removal: 0.

No Right on Red: 0.

Other: 3.

“Which bicycle improvements would you like in your community?”

Class 1: Shared-Use Path: 4.

Class 2: Bike Lane: 2.

Class 2B: Buffered Bike Lane: 6.

Class 3: Bike Boulevard: 0.

Class 4: Separated Bikeway: 3.

Other: 0.

“Which bicycle improvements do you NOT like?”

Class 1: Shared-Use Path: 6.

Class 2: Bike Lane: 4.

Class 2B: Buffered Bike Lane: 2.

Class 3: Bike Boulevard: 2.

Class 4: Separated Bikeway: 2.

Other: 0.

Virtual Workshops – May 18 and 20, 2021:

Attendees:

Project Team Staff:

- Mikki McDaniel, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Bailey Affolter, Sacramento County Department of Transportation.
- Libby Nachman, Alta Planning.
- Kiara Reed, WALKSacramento.
- Alicia Brown, WALKSacramento.
- Molly Wagner, WALKSacramento.
- Jordan Grimaldi, WALKSacramento.
- Mileda Bermudez, Spanish Interpreter.

Tuesday, May 18th from 6:00 – 7:30 pm:

- 8 project staff.
- 27 attendees via Zoom.

3 attendees via Facebook Live Thursday, May 20th from 12:00 – 1:30 pm:

- 7 project staff.
- 17 attendees via Zoom.
- 4 attendees via Facebook Live.

A screenshot is included of the Zoom meeting held for the Spring Evening Workshop.

Workshop Summary:

Two workshops were held on Tuesday, May 18th and Thursday, May 20th for the Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan. The goal of the workshops was to share the draft infrastructure recommendations that were developed after Phase I and to gather feedback on what types of infrastructure recommendations participants liked, didn't like, and opportunities for improvement. The workshops began with a presentation about the Active Transportation Plan, followed by a demonstration of the webmap tool. Online polls and open discussion portions were interspersed throughout to get a better sense of project priorities and preferences on draft infrastructure recommendations.

Input Received:

a.) Goals and Priorities:

- When asked about what they would like to see on their “dream streets”, workshop participants indicated wide and well-maintained sidewalks, trees, streets without cars, 20mph roads, protected and separated bikeways, audible signals, lighting, smooth pavement without potholes, and seating.
- Across both of the workshops, participants overwhelmingly indicated safety as the highest priority for project implementation (48% on May 18th and 50% on May 20th). At the May 18th workshop, the second highest priority was community need (18.5%) and the third highest priority was access (15%). At the May 20th workshop, community need, equity, and access were all tied for the second highest priority (14%).
- Access from a disability perspective was highlighted as an important priority for many participants across both of the workshops.
- Sidewalk infill and maintenance was another priority that participants brought up across both workshops. In particular, there is a need for prioritizing sidewalks near schools for a Safe Routes to School approach.
- First and last mile access to and from transit is important for ensuring that people are able to complete trips to any destination, especially by walking or rolling.
- Participants wanted better connections between neighborhoods to commercial and recreational destinations.
- Overall, participants expressed a desire for greater separation of active transportation modes from vehicle traffic.
- Other priorities included feasibility of funding, focusing improvements on streets that don’t have room for bike lanes, and addressing pre-existing issues before starting new projects.

b.) Preferred Infrastructure Improvements:

- Participants were invited to participate in a poll about desired pedestrian infrastructure improvements in their communities. Participants were able to vote for as many improvements as they liked.

    1. At the workshop on May 18th, the top three pedestrian improvements that participants wanted to see in their communities were curb extensions (17%), sidewalks (15%), and crosswalks (15%).
    2. At the workshop on May 20th, the top three pedestrian improvements that participants wanted to see in their communities were sidewalks (25%), leading pedestrian intervals (20%), and curb extensions (15%).
- Participants were invited to participate in a poll about desired bicycle infrastructure improvements in their communities. Participants were able to vote for as many improvements as they liked.
    1. At the workshop on May 18th, the top three bicycle improvements that participants wanted to see in their communities were protected bike lanes (27.5%), bike boulevards (20%), and buffered bike lanes (20%).
    2. At the workshop on May 20th, the top three bicycle improvements that participants wanted to see in their communities were shared use paths (33%), buffered bike lanes (33%), and protected bike lanes (16%).
- In addition to the above infrastructure preferences, participants also indicated a need for the following improvements to comfort and safety of walking, biking, and rolling:
    1. There need to be more pedestrian oriented street lights, especially at intersections. Lack of streetlights was a particular issue in the Carmichael neighborhood.
    2. There is a need for sidewalk infill in neighborhoods that do not currently have sidewalks, such as Fair Oaks.
    3. There need to be more consistent implementation of pedestrian pushbuttons. For example, when crossing from Cottage Way to Winding Way across Watt Avenue, the pedestrian pushbutton is only on one side of the street.
- Additional infrastructure that participants generally supported or expressed a desire for included:
    - Protected bike lanes.
    - Median refuge islands.

- Leading pedestrian intervals.
- Curb extensions.
- Roundabouts could be considered in place of signalized intersections where feasible.

c.) Infrastructure Improvements of Concern:

- Participants were invited to participate in a poll about pedestrian infrastructure improvements that they have concerns with or would not want to see in their communities. Participants were able to vote for as many improvements as they did not like, with the option to say they liked all types of improvements.
    1. At the workshop on May 18th, most participants responded that they liked all types of pedestrian improvements (29%). However, the top pedestrian improvements that participants did not want to see in their communities were median refuge islands (14%), pedestrian hybrid beacons (14%), rectangular rapid flashing beacons (9.5%), and curb extensions (9.5%).
    2. At the workshop on May 20th, most participants responded that they liked all types of pedestrian improvements (50%). However, the top pedestrian improvement that participants did not want to see in their communities was no right on red signals (50%).
- Participants were invited to participate in a poll about bicycle infrastructure improvements that they have concerns with or would not want to see in their communities. Participants were able to vote for as many improvements as they did not like, with the option to say they liked all types of improvements.
    1. At the workshop on May 18th, most participants responded that they liked all types of bike improvements (39%). However, the top bicycle improvements that participants did not want to see in their communities were shared use paths (17%), buffered bike lanes (11%), and bike boulevards (11%).
    2. At the workshop on May 20th, most participants responded that they liked all types of bike improvements (67%). However, the top bicycle

improvements that participants did not want to see in their communities were bike boulevards (17%) and protected bike lanes (17%).

- Participants indicated concerns with protected bike lanes for a variety of reasons, including that they take up too much roadspace, they are not safe for bicyclists if they are poorly designed, impacts to bus stop access, and impacts to accessibility overall, especially for people who are blind or low vision.
    - Participants were interested in learning more about the specific design of the proposed Class 4 bike lanes, particularly their impact on bus stops along Howe Avenue, Fulton Avenue, and El Camino Avenue.
- Participants shared concerns with leading pedestrian intervals and other signal improvements, particularly how they will impact audible signals and people who are blind or low vision.
    - Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons, pedestrian hybrid beacons, and other signal improvements must be coordinated with audible signals to be safe for pedestrians who are blind or low vision. There were also concerns that flashing lights may cause headaches or seizures.
- Participants generally did not like shared use paths due to potential conflicts between pedestrians and bicyclists, and indicated that more education or fully separated facilities between pedestrians and bicyclists would be ideal.
- Additional questions and concerns about bike infrastructure included ensuring that cars would not use the bike Lane as a passing Lane and providing dedicated bike parking so that bikes, scooters, and shared rideables would not be left in the sidewalk.

d.) Challenging Locations:

- Throughout both of the workshops, participants shared specific locations that remain challenging for walking, biking, and rolling. These locations include:

1. The County previously removed a pedestrian and bike ramp at the Merrywood and Country Club Center in Arden Arcade, which restricts active transportation access.
2. Large intersections that are difficult to cross include Arden Way and Cottage Way, and El Camino Avenue and Eastern Avenue.
3. There is a Dutch Bros across from El Camino Fundamental High School that attracts a lot of traffic and is not pedestrian and bike friendly.
4. A lot of people use active transportation along Winding Way between Fair Oaks Boulevard and Illinois Avenue, even though there are no sidewalks and there is not enough space to walk, bike, or roll.
5. Scripps Drive was designed for vehicles, and the sidewalks were installed before ADA requirements. The sidewalks are at an extreme angle and are also now broken.
6. Madison Avenue has areas of the street that need repaving.
7. There is a need for a bike path by Haggin Oaks and Howe Park.
8. Sidewalks have been requested on Bell Avenue for access to Dyer Kelly Elementary and on Howe Avenue for access to Howe Avenue Elementary, but have not been installed for years.

e.) Lessons Learned:

- Tuesday, May 18th:
    1. Stop sharing screen after discussion slide.
    2. End Zoom meeting to log everyone off before debrief.
    3. Interpretation worked well, including recording in Spanish.
- Thursday, May 20th:
    1. Make sure to engage with more members of the blind community.
    2. Make sure there’s a similar # of bike and ped projects in final plan, or show in comparable terms.

3. Mikki to chat with disability advisory committee about class 4's and transit access.

f.) Key Questions:

- Funding:
    1. To what extent will this plan be supported by funding? What is the commitment in resources to actually implement the plan?
    2. Are there any actual grants or other funding sources that are actively being pursued right now?
    3. Our community of Arden Arcade would receive a whole lot more money for transportation if it was an incorporated city. Would the County be supportive of establishment of new cities?
- Education and Programming:
    1. Will there be any consequences for bicyclers who ride on sidewalks?
    2. How will education for pedestrian safety be addressed to driving community?
    3. Will safe routes to school specifically be addressed in this plan?
- System Connectivity:
    1. How are County bike routes coordinated with City of Sacramento bike routes?
    2. What amount of collaboration are you doing with Rancho Cordova where shared boundaries are concerned, like Bradshaw Road and Old Placerville Road?
    3. How does this Plan intersect with SACOG's trails plan and also help provide connections with Sacramento's Transportation Priorities Plan?
- Disability Accessibility:
    1. Who is on the technical advisory committee? In particular, people with disabilities need to be on the technical advisory committee and part of the design process.
    2. How does the webmap tool work for those visually impaired? Can it screen read?

3. Has the project established a list of mobility needs?
4. What are your plans to implement and install more audible signals? What, if anything, will the plan do to have a more formalized way of implementing these installments?
5. Will the blind community be consulted to determine which intersections will be most beneficial?

- Infrastructure and Design:
    1. What is the typical vehicle speed that is considered conducive to a “walkable” community?
    2. Is there a pedestrian crossing option that has proven to be more effective at preventing collisions and pedestrian accidents? Crosswalks seem to be largely ignored by drivers.
    3. Will maintenance of existing sidewalks (such as lifted panels or trip hazards) be addressed as part of the Plan? Will it be a priority to make ALL sidewalks safe, specifically existing sidewalks, for pedestrian travel?
    4. For Class 4 bike lanes, are you coordinating with maintenance staff for sweeping/cleaning of the bike lanes? If a street sweeper cannot fit, what measures are being taken?
    5. There are around 1500 bike projects but only 93 pedestrian projects. Given almost everyone is a pedestrian at some point but not all of us ride bicycles, why is the plan so bike heavy?
    6. Is there a published schedule of sidewalk and road maintenance for the various county areas? Does this include limitations on funding for the various areas?
    7. Are there plans to implement and install more pedestrian signals?

A series of surveys was conducted in the Spring Evening Workshop, in which there were 14 respondents. The questions will be listed first, followed by the responses, and number of votes if applicable.

“What priorities are most important to you? Please select your top two.”

Community Need: 5.

Equity: 2.

Safety: 13.

Comfort: 0.

Access: 4.

Connectivity: 2.

Other: 1.

“My dream street has…” (The following are a few of the statements used to fill in the blank)

Bikes, smooth straight sidewalks and clearly marked crosswalks, no cars, is tree-lined, protected bike lanes, is debris-free, diversity, parking, 20 mph speed limit, seating.

“Which pedestrian improvements would you like to see in your community (select all that apply)?”

Sidewalks: 10.

Crosswalks: 10.

Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon: 4.

Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon: 3.

Curb Extensions: 11.

Leading Pedestrian Interval: 6.

Median Refuge Island: 5.

Slip Lane Removal: 5.

No Right on Red: 6.

Other: 5.

“Which bicycle improvements would you like to see in your community (select all that apply)?”

Shared-Use Path: 4.

Bike Lane: 5.

Buffered Bike Lane: 8.

Bike Boulevard: 8.

Protected Bike Lane: 11.

Other: 4.

Digital Engagement Summaries:

ONLINE COMMUNITY SURVEY – WINTER 2020/2021:

Survey Statistics:

During the first phase of community engagement, over 830 community members took the online survey. The survey opened in July 2020 and closed in January 2021. The survey was made available in both English, Spanish, and Russian. There were 832 English responses, 15 Spanish responses, and 4 Russian responses. The survey was sent out to multiple Sacramento County newsletter lists, post on social media, and distributed through partnerships with community-based organizations. A summary of survey findings is in the next section.

Demographics:

The survey was taken by a diverse range of Sacramento County residents. All age groups were well represented except the age 74 and older group. About half of residents identified as non-white (two percent American-Indian or Alaska Native, 12 percent Asian, 12 percent black, five percent Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 19 percent Latino. The survey respondents are 47 percent women, 42 percent men, and 4 percent nonbinary.

Key Survey Takeaways:

Pre-COVID travel behavior:

Almost two-thirds of survey participants walked/ran for fun or exercise during normal times, and nearly half of participants walked to reach a destination (store, school, work, etc.). Over 40 percent of participants stated that they bicycle for fun or exercise, and just under 30 percent said that they bike to destinations. Less than one-fifth of respondents indicated that they took public transportation. There were no substantial differences

between respondents' use of modes between pre-COVID and current times. The one exception was a about a 10% drop in respondents taking public transit.

Active Transportation to Destinations:

Respondents were asked what destinations they would walk or bike to if it was more comfortable and convenient. Four answer choices were selected by at least 40 percent of all respondents (in order from most to least selected): parks (60 percent), fun or exercise (56 percent), stores (54 percent), and restaurants/bars (41 percent). These are the destinations that residents are most likely to walk or bike to. Trips to/from school were only selected by 26 percent of respondents. In a separate question, parents of school-aged children were asked what factors would encourage more walking and biking trips. The top four responses are safety (traffic-related), safety (crime- related), if the school was closer, and if there were more ways to cross the street along their route.

Walking:

When asked how much they agree with, "I feel comfortable walking around in my community," only 15 percent of respondents strongly agreed. Over 45 percent of respondents were either neutral (33 percent) or disagreed (13 percent) with the statement. Over 50 percent of respondents indicated that they were concerned about being hit by a car and crime and personal safety. Poor or lack of streetlights and missing sidewalks were listed as concerns by over one-quarter of respondents. The top five changes that would increase respondent comfort (listed by over one-third of respondents) are safer ways to cross the street, slower traffic, building sidewalks where they are missing, better lighting for pedestrians, and fixing broken sidewalks.

Bicycling:

When asked how much do you agree with, "I feel comfortable biking around in my community," only 9 percent of respondents strongly agreed. Over 59 percent of respondents were either neutral (38%) or disagreed (21%) with the statement. Over

two-thirds of respondents indicated that they were worried about being hit by a car. Over one-third of residents indicated that they were concerned about crime and personal safety and the lack of bike lanes or paths to bicycle. Over one-quarter of respondents were concerned about having no streetlights at night and having no secure bike parking at their destination. Building more bike lanes/other dedicated facilities was the most selected improvement, by 55% of respondents. Three additional improvements were selected by over 40% of respondents: slower traffic, greater separation from vehicle traffic, and wider bike lanes.

Interactive Web Map Summary – Summer 2020 – January 2021:

The first phase of the interactive web map launched in summer 2020 and closed in January 2021. Over 420 comments were left on the interactive web map. Users could draw their current or preferred walking or biking routes and drop points at intersections or other locations that they had comments on. Users could like, dislike, and leave additional comments on others' routes and points. The public identified concerns on over 110 different roadway segments and over 70 intersections.

The following issues were noted throughout the County:

- Missing sidewalks are barriers.
- Desire for safer routes to schools and libraries.
- Safer park access.
- More and enhanced river crossings.
- Poor light rail station access.
- Uncomfortable intersection crossings.
- Desire for safer bicycle facilities.

The most frequently mentioned corridors needing improvement were:

- Fair Oaks Boulevard.
- Watt Avenue.
- Whitney Avenue.

- Cypress Avenue.
- Bell Street.
- Winding Way.
- Madison Avenue.

Themes for Recommendations:

Based on an analysis of both the concerns of people walking and biking and their stated preferences for potential improvements, the following themes should influence the development of pedestrian and bicycle recommendations.

- Parks, commercial areas, and entertainment districts are the most desired walking and biking destinations. The development of priority areas should include considerations for these destinations.
- Infrastructure safety improvements are the top items that would make parents more comfortable letting their children walk or bike.
- Enhanced and safer ways to cross the street and closing sidewalk gaps are important priorities for pedestrians in Sacramento County.
    - Improved crossings are especially important around schools.
- A super-majority of bicycling respondents are concerned about being hit by cars. Building low-stress, separated bikeways will make more people comfortable and attract additional bike trips.
- Sacramento County residents love to walk, run, and bike for fun and exercise. Improving access to trails and implementing neighborhood- scale improvements will create
- an attractive walking and biking environment for various trip types.
- Provide wider shoulders in rural areas.

Phase 2 Recommendations Webmap Comments – Spring and Summer 2021:

The following three tables present all public comments from the website and interactive map during Phase 2 Engagement. Table B-1 includes general comments left via the website's contact form. Over 30 website contacts and emails were received by the project team during the project. Table B-2 contains comments on sidewalk recommendations. Table B-3 has comments on recommended bicycle projects.

Table B-1: General Comments:

Comment will be listed first, followed by Submission time, and Category.

1.) On all bike paths please paint the names of the streets that that the exit takes you too. When you pass the access paths you don't know what street it takes you to. (Submitted 10/3/2020, 8:36; Category: Wayfinding.)

2.) Can you explain better what each of the class trails mean. Maybe when we click on the legend you can click on the class and there will be an EASY to understand explanation of the class.
Example: cars, no cars, horses, no horses, bigger Lane next to road, width of trail, anything else you know that we don't know etc. (Submitted 4/28/2021, 18:14; Category: Website.)

3.) The street INDUSTRY- has multiple land owners, businesses and fencing. It does NOT go all the way through to Winona.
I can send pictures as it won't allow me to upload.
There is an OLD railroad track (on some private land) not being used and would make a perfect walking area- behind the businesses on Orange Grove (from Off Roseville Road to Orange grove (next to Watt Avenue) no cars- perfect area to upgrade. The PBID would love to give this area 'a sense of place,' which connects the area. (Submitted 5/7/2021, 11:46; Category: Trails.)

4.) I appreciate the work that has been done on this, but there still needs to be considerable improvement in the downtown area (within 5 miles of downtown) for people who commute downtown for work. (Submitted 6/10/2021, 11:16; Category: General.)

5.) Hi, I'd like to comment but I'm not getting an option when I click on the map recommendation. I think the bike path and the sidewalk idea in Freeport and connection to Sacramento is perfect. (Submitted 6/15/2021, 17:02; Category: Infrastructure.)

6.) Looking at your plans I very much like the bike trail concept. Regarding the sidewalk, I would need to know how much additional room next to the road it would require. If we have to give up some of our property line and move fences & landscaping I would have issues with the project. My address is **** Freeport Blvd. 95832. Best Regards, Bob Lake. (Submitted 6/16/2021, 17:00; Category: Sidewalks.)

7.) I am excited to see the proposed bicycle paths proposed for the Herald area. A few sidewalks would be nice, like on Ivie Road, by the school and post office and Herald Road, by the store and park. (Submitted 6/23/2021, 18:07; Category: Sidewalks.)

8.) Love the buffered bike Lane down Arden for Arden and Mariemont school kids and bikers trying to safely get to American River bike trail.
But how are bikers supposed to get safely across busy Fair Oaks using the bike boulevard from Los Molinos to Estates? There is no light there. Why not San Ramon to Wilhaggen where there is a light? That is the way I go instead of dangerous Arden. (Maple Glenn—which could connect to Winding Creek BB—to La Sierra to San Ramon, Wilhaggen, Crondall to Estates.) (Submitted 6/24/2021, 11:13; Category: Infrastructure.)

Table B-2: Sidewalk Recommendation Comments:

ID will be listed first, followed by additional comment details.

ID 435:

Name: Anonymous.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Bayou Way.

Comment: Walkability to Airport.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/28/2021, 16:48.

ID 436:

Name: Sarah R Morgan.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Chicago Avenue.

Comment: Road is a narrow two Lane with no sidewalks and have been run off the road in the past few months while I was running.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/28/2021, 17:26.

ID 437:

Name: Sarah R Morgan.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Comment: Small area of sidewalk missing between Temple Park and shopping center on corner.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/28/2021, 17:33.

ID 438:

Name: PATTY WAIT.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Morse Avenue.

Street 2: Keeney Way.

Street 3: Hurley Way.

Comment: There are no sidewalks on Morse. There is a fair amount of traffic.

Likes: 2.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/28/2021, 17:39.

ID 439:

Name: Patricia Furey.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Wedgewood Avenue.

Comment: Corner of Fair Oaks Blvd and Wedgewood in front of dental office. The sidewalk ends, at the north of entrance to parking lot. Positions pedestrians to be just a foot away from passing traffic. Very dangerous for pedestrians to navigate.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/28/2021, 18:37.

ID 440:

Name: Patricia Furey.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Tarshes Drive.

Comment: The entrance to Tarshes requires pedestrians to cross California Avenue without a crosswalk. The concrete dividers that separate the foot path

from the road are crumbling or gone. Cars turning east onto Tarshes take the corner fast without looking for pedestrians and drive into the designated walking Lane.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/28/2021, 18:54.

ID 441:

Name: Patricia Furey.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Wedgewood Avenue.

Comment: Continuation of improvement in front of Dental Office on the corner of Fair Oaks and Wedgewood.

Likes: 0

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/28/2021, 19:02.

ID 442:

Name: Fayzah.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Bradshaw Road.

Comment: There are 2 sections with sidewalk gaps on the Rancho Cordova side, I'd like to see these resolved in conjunction with the City of Rancho Cordova.

Likes: 1.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/29/2021, 16:31.

ID 443:

Name: Mattie Parfitt.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Bell Street.

Comment: There is no sidewalk to the corner. The walk button on the pole at this corner is more than 5 feet off the ground, too, which is ridiculous.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 4/29/2021, 20:13.

ID 444:

Name: Nancy Shigenaga.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Locust Avenue.

Comment: Sidewalk needs to continue to Garfield.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 5/8/2021, 8:44.

ID 445:

Name: Anonymous.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Watt Avenue.

Comment: Two sections west side of Watt near Kings/Chenu.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 5/18/2021, 20:21.

ID 446:

Name: Anonymous.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Marconi Avenue.

Comment: No sidewalk either side of Marconi—gap near Morse is a priority.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 5/18/2021, 20:25.

ID 447:

Name: Giovanni.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Vintage Park Drive.

Comment: I think there should be a way to safely get to the park from the elementary.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 5/31/2021, 17:15.

ID 448:

Name: Albert Q.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: South of Fisherman's Lake.

Street 2: North of Radio Road.

Street 3: West of El Centro Road.

Comment: Need trails on the south side of the canal.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 16:26.

ID 449:

Name: Monica Placencia.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Walnut Avenue.

Comment: I walk this road everyday with my dogs there isn't a sidewalk or shoulder. My kids ride their bikes to school and they are too scared to take this direct road. Please put a sidewalk here.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 16:27.

ID 450:

Name: Alexa Mergen.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Twitchell Island Road.

Street 2: Brannan Island Road.

Comment: I'm trying to indicate we need sidewalk gaps on Twitchell Island Road, Brannan Island Road along Seven-Mile Slough as well. Popular biking/walking areas.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 17:08.

ID 451:

Name: Matt.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Jackson Slough Road.

Comment: Sidewalk improvements must be extended south on Jackson Slough Road to Brannan Island Road.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 17:19.

ID 452:

Name: Matt.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Brannan Island Road.

Comment: Sidewalk improvements are badly needed along Brannan Island Road. (the ‘Delta Loop’, a popular boating/restaurant/ sightseeing route).

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 17:23.

ID 453:

Name: Dax-Conroy Gayle.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Whitney Drive.

Street 2: Sue Pam Drive.

Comment: Narrow edge no sidewalk safety or bicycle safety for children and adults walking to Carmichael Park, the largest park in the region. This part of Whitney Avenue has high rates of car travel to get to Fair Oaks Blvd.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 18:53.

ID 454:

Name: Lee Frederiksen.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Landis Avenue.

Comment: Landis is very dangerous to walk on. It is narrow and no shoulders, and has a lot of traffic.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 20:08.

ID 455:

Name: Jill Sorenson.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Becerra Way.

Comment: This road is heavily used by elementary and high school students. It would be much safer with a sidewalk. Traffic has increased on Becerra due to the closure of the pick up parking lot at Mira Loma High School off of Edison. Parents now pick up via Becerra. There is heavy traffic with kids trying to navigate on bike and foot between Whitney and Edison. It can get very sketchy!

Likes: 2.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/8/2021, 20:15.

ID 456:

Name: Vincent King (SRPD).

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: South of Hanfield Drive/ Montefalco Way.

Comment: Connect park to basin with future water supply project.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/9/2021, 12:29.

ID 457:

Name: Vincent King (SRPD).

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Mendocino Boulevard.

Comment: Southgate will add sidewalk, but would love DOT help completing it along Mendocino.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/9/2021, 12:58.

ID 458:

Name: Vincent King (SRPD).

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: 47th Avenue.

Comment: Gap.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/9/2021, 13:00.

ID 459:

Name: Vincent King (SRPD).

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Orange Avenue.

Comment: Link parks and schools.

Likes: 1.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/9/2021, 13:01.

ID 460:

Name: Vincent King (SRPD).

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Orange Avenue.

Street 2: Persimmon Avenue.

Comment: Gap. Link to Park and Community Center.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/9/2021, 13:04.

ID (not numbered):

Name: Ruth Ann Bertsch.

Type: Comment.

Comment: Morse here needs to slow down the cars. they think they're on an expressway when they turn from Arden onto South-bound Morse. Bike lanes are already present for some of this.

Date: 6/10/2021, 15:57.

ID (not numbered):

Name: Ruth Ann Bertsch.

Type: Comment.

Comment: The cars need to slow down on Morse. People turn onto Morse from Arden acting as if it were a speedway. Bike lanes won't be enough.

Date: 6/10/2021, 15:58.

ID 461:

Name: Ruth Ann Bertsch.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Sierra Boulevard.

Street 2: Barberry Lane.

Street 3: Larch Lane.

Comment: It is a shame that we appear to be requesting sidewalks on the direct, straight but noisy and busy streets when we could be routing pedestrians through some of our most beautiful neighborhoods.
Likes: 2.
Dislikes: 0.
Date: 6/10/2021, 16:07.

ID 462:

Name: Fayzah.
Type: Sidewalk Gap.
Street: Bradshaw Road.
Street 2: Lincoln Village Drive.
Comment: LPI (or Leading Ped Interval) would be nice to reduce conflict with northbound cars turning east at the intersection. Also the ped refuge in this crossing is too small to accommodate more than one person, like families or 2+ cyclists. Many cars use the slip Lane that should not BE in the slip lane, and they don't yield to peds.
Likes: 0.
Dislikes: 0.
Date: 6/11/2021, 11:10.

ID 463:

Name: Fayzah.
Type: Sidewalk Gap.
Street: Bradshaw Road.
Street 2: Old Placerville Road.
Comment: LPI for signal here would be good. Also my kids, travelling northbound going home from Dollar Tree, have almost been struck by the cars turning north coming off Old Placerville (right on red) several times, and once I witnessed a

similar near-miss with a woman travelling in an electric wheelchair ahead of me in the crosswalk. Having/using our right-of-way should not be so scary.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/11/2021, 11:28.

ID 464:

Name: Lee Frederiksen.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Landis Avenue.

Comment: Landis Avenue is extremely dangerous to walk along. It has a lot of traffic, is very narrow, and has no shoulders to step onto when a car is coming.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/12/2021, 7:29.

ID 465:

Name: A.B.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: 48th Avenue.

Comment: Sidewalk gap along 48th Avenue. This is critical route for students traveling to school.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/22/2021, 17:55.

ID 466:

Name: A.B.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: 48th Avenue.

Street 2: Wesley Avenue.

Street 3: 49th Avenue.

Comment: Sidewalk gap limits low-stress routes to school and the park.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/22/2021, 17:57.

ID 467:

Name: Anonymous.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Wesley Avenue.

Comment: The sidewalks gap and crossings at Cuny Avenue and Wesley do not make sense.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/22/2021, 17:58.

ID 468:

Name: Anonymous.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Martin Luther King Junior Blvd.

Comment: horrible connections because sidewalk is missing. Students have nowhere to walk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/22/2021, 18:00.

ID 469:

Name: Sue Schooley.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Buena Vista Avenue.

Street 2: Corona Vista Way.

Comment: this is a major route for high school students to get to BV high school, very fast traffic, yet no sidewalks on either side. high importance for Safe Routes to Schools.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 17:08.

ID 470:

Name: Sue Schooley.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Buena Vista Avenue.

Comment: Both sides of Buena Vista lacking sidewalk and it’s a major route to BV for high school students. (not sure if my earlier comment went through—might be duplicate.)

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 17:10.

ID 471:

Name: Maria Trefilova.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Locust Avenue.

Comment: Missing sidewalk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 20:57.

ID 472:

Name: Maria Trefilova.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Locust Avenue.

Street 2: Hackberry Lane.

Comment: Missing sidewalk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 20:58.

ID 473:

Name: Maria Trefilova.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Hackberry Lane.

Comment: Missing sidewalk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 20:59.

ID 474:

Name: Maria Trefilova.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Locust Avenue.

Street 2: Virgusell Circle.

Comment: Missing sidewalk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 21:01.

ID 475:

Name: Maria Trefilova.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Hackberry Lane.

Comment: Missing sidewalk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 21:02.

ID 476:

Name: Maria Trefilova.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Garfield Avenue.

Comment: Missing sidewalk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/23/2021, 21:03.

ID 477:

Name: Tamie Dramer.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Watt Avenue.

Comment: There are no crosswalks or lights for safe ped/cycle crossing here.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/24/2021, 14:46.

ID 478:

Name: Dorothy Putnam-Smith.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Cardinal Road.

Comment: No sidewalks for Children to school or bicycles. This thoroughfare is used a lot by people picking their children up from school, sidewalks are essential.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/27/2021, 13:10.

ID 479:

Name: Barbara Moore.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Cypress Avenue.

Comment: Sidewalk on North side of Cypress between Dena Way and Pasadena.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/27/2021, 19:39.

ID 480:

Name: Heidi Satter.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Mills Road.

Comment: Sidewalks needed for the safety of the many students at the nearby school. Safe walk routes to school may help reduce tremendous vehicle traffic.

Likes: 1.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/29/2021, 8:00.

ID 481:

Name: Dean Dal Ben.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Starburst Way.

Comment: Sidewalks are needed on both sides of Starburst Way from Sunnyfield Way to Jacinto Avenue. Starburst Way is used by people walking to the North Laguna Creek Park as well as getting to Jacinto Avenue to go to CRC and Barbara Comstock Morse elementary school. This area turns into a muddy mess during the rain and people walking or riding bikes in the street are in danger from vehicles driving on this roadway.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/29/2021, 16:43.

ID 482:

Name: Dean Dal Ben.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Bruceville Road.

Comment: Gap is on west side of Bruceville Road. A safe walkway is needed to walk safely north on Bruceville to get to CRC or Barbara Comstock Morse Elementary School or the library or go south on Bruceville to get to businesses near Bruceville and Center Parkway.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/29/2021, 16:51.

ID 483:

Name: Dean Dal Ben.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Bruceville Road.

Comment: This section on the west side of Bruceville Road leads to the several businesses located in the area defined by Bruceville Road, Sheldon Road and Center Parkway. People need a safe way to avoid the heavy traffic on Bruceville Road when they walk to or from this business area.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/29/2021, 16:59.

ID 484:

Name: Dean Dal Ben.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Jacinto Avenue.

Comment: There is an interior sidewalk within the North Laguna Creek park along the northwest side of the park facing Jacinto Avenue but this curves deeply within the park away from the road. For the safety and convenience of those walking in this area who want a more direct walking route, the city should provide a city sidewalk as normal near the road and not take advantage of park funds/bonds to pay for a city sidewalk vs. a park walkway.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/29/2021, 17:08.

ID 485:

Name: Lee Frederiksen.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Landis Avenue.

Comment: Need sidewalks. Very dangerous to walk.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/30/2021, 10:43.

ID 486:

Name: Carrie Frederiksen.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Landis Avenue.

Comment: Landis Avenue is very dangerous to walk/bike on.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/30/2021, 10:46.

ID 487:

Name: Scott Harger.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Watt Avenue.

Comment: Heading South on the west side of Watt the sidewalk abruptly ends and a pedestrian is forced out onto Watt.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/30/2021, 14:46.

ID 488:

Name: Scott Harger.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: East of Watt Avenue.

Comment: This is a drive way into the Telephone Building. The cross slope of the driveway can force a wheelchair user into oncoming traffic. Hazardous for a hand cycle.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/30/2021, 14:51.

ID 489:

Name: Scott Harger.

Type: Sidewalk Gap.

Street: Marconi Avenue.

Comment: This is a well used pedestrian and bike Path of travel, to access Raley's and bus stops. Both sides of Marconi need to be addressed.

Likes: 0.

Dislikes: 0.

Date: 6/30/2021, 14:57.

Table B-3: Bicycle Recommendation Comments:

Street and/or Cross Streets will be listed first, followed by the recommended Bikeway Class at that location, and additional comment details.

Cross Street 1: Morrison Creek Trail, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Bradshaw Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Cross Street 1: Excelsior Road, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: South Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Cross Street 1: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: South Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: DC.

Comment: Yes! Please make separated bike facilities part of any expansions or upgrades to Jackson Road. This corridor provides one of the few consistent through routes through this developing area.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Cross Street 1: Excelsior Road.

Cross Street 2: Waterman Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: The alignment of this trail has changed to follow Laguna Creek north along Waterman Road. It would be nice to see that continued into the County along the creek.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Cross Street 1: Markfield Way.

Cross Street 2: Laguna Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: This is old line work. You can get more accurate data from the Odgen Subdivision tentative map approved by Sacramento County.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Cross Street 1: Leland Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Florencia Lane.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Cross Street 1: Leland Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Florencia Lane.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Cross Street 1: Florencia Lane.

Cross Street 2: Rogers Road, Admiral Lane.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Cross Street 1: Gerber Road.

Cross Street 2: Waterman Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Need crossing of Gerber Road.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Cross Street 1: Mccoy Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Elder Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Extend Class 1, 2, 3, or 4 to Elk Grove Florin crossing. Class 1 preferred.

Net Likes: 0.

Cross Street 1: Florin Road.

Cross Street 2: Waterman Road, Dersingham Drive, Brevard Court, Amarone Way, Heathfield Way.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Continue south to connect to existing trail.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 5.

Cross Street 1: Gardner Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Elder Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: North of Florin Road, the Florin Vineyard Gap Plan does not call for class 1. This is a nice idea, but projects approved by the County and the County

plan do not account for class 1 north of Florin Road. A funding mechanism and amendment to the FV Gap Plan is needed for this to occur.

Comment Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Cross Street 1: Clairidge Oak Court.

Cross Street 2: Dwight Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Cross Street 1: Big Horn Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Dwight Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jeff D.

Comment: I like the existence of this path, but I don't understand why it is Class 2. There is no road at that location. This should be Class 1 since the road and railroad crossing have been closed to vehicle traffic.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 3.

Net Likes: Negative 2.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: TREE VIEW Road, JACKSON Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Cross Street 1: Grant Line Road.

Cross Street 2: Kiefer Boulevard, Jackson Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Cross Street 1: Kenosha Road.

Cross Street 2: White Rock Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Cross Street 1: Aerojet Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Cross Street 1: Prairie City Road.

Cross Street 2: Aerojet Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Brett Bollinger.

Comment: This will be a good connection to the Folsom Plan Area.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Cross Street 1: Folsom Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Aerojet Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Cross Street 1: Roseville Road, Track Crossing Trail.

Cross Street 2: Orange Grove Avenue, Industry Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: 14th Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Lissetta Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Stockton Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 6.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: 24th Street.

Cross Street 1: Patrol Road.

Cross Street 2: U street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: 2nd Street.

Cross Street 1: Ascot Avenue.

Cross Street 2: U Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Kenneth.

Comment: Roadway is currently not big enough for two vehicles. How do you plan to add bike lanes?

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: 41st Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Franklin Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: 44th Street, Lemon Hill Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Lots of traffic for a shared path, no? Class 4.

Rec Likes: 4.

Comment Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 2.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: 44th Street.

Cross Street 1: Fruitridge Road.

Cross Street 2: Highway 99 Northbound, Highway 99 Southbound.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: The (green) multi use path show does not exist connecting to Le Donne Drive. This is currently an open field, but planned development with Mutual Housing and Habitat for Humanity. That project will provide a public bike/ped connection to 46th street. Suggest building from this connection with Class 2 on 46th and 3 through Nicholas Park to 47th Street and 50th Avenue.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 4.

Net Likes: Negative 2.

Street: 47th Avenue.

Cross Street 1: 27th Street, Otto Circle.

Cross Street 2: Leola Way.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: DC.

Comment: Please prioritize this improvement. This is a key east-west corridor but is currently a very hostile environment for non-drivers. This would help provide east-west bike/ped connectivity, which is severely lacking in south Sacramento. Also please prioritize making the freeway crossing safer for bikes and peds.

Rec Likes: 4.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: 47th Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Burns Way.

Cross Street 2: Wire Drive, Serna Center Driveway.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: South of Sampson Blvd and 47th Avenue there is a planned development with a portion of the creek running through it. DOT should work with DWR to allow bike/pedestrian access along the maintenance road between 47th and 50th. This will provide safer more direct access to Nicholas Park.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: 65th Street.

Cross Street 1: Stockton Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Florin Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: 66th Avenue.

Cross Street 1: 55th Street.

Cross Street 2: Stockton Boulevard, Chandler Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Admiral Lane.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Gerber Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Aerojet Road.

Cross Street 1: Baltimore Street.

Cross Street 2: Louisiana Road, Unnamed Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Airport Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Bayou Way.

Cross Street 2: Unnamed Road, Airport Boulevard East.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Dan.

Comment: Love the possibility to bike to the airport!

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Alder Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Aerojet Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path..

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Alder Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Empire Ranch Road, Russell Ranch Road, Grand Prairie Road, Rustic Ridge Circle, View Terrace Court, Alder Creek Parkway, Summit Street.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Janet Rodgers.

Comment: I will love this trail if you don't cut ANY trees down.

Rec Likes: 18.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 20.

Street: Almond Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Pershing Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Include bike signals at Greenback.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Alta Arden Expressway.

Cross Street 1: Fulton Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Cross Street 1: Dillard Road.

Cross Street 2: Boessow Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Amalgam Way.

Cross Street 1: Gold River Road.

Cross Street 2: Pyrites Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Arcade Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Arcade Creek Trail.

Cross Street 2: Arcade Creek Trail, Auburn Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Benjamin Etgen.

Comment: A contiguous bike trail from American River College to Light Rail was planned when light rail was installed 32 years ago. This needs to happen to allow American River College to continue to serve our community without contributing to climate change and the increasing debt burden of our students for cars, gasoline, insurance, and maintenance.

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Arcade Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Winding Way.

Cross Street 2: Garfield Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Benjamin Etgen.

Comment: This needs to be connected to a bikeway to light rail.

Rec Likes: 9.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 10.

Street: Arcade Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Madison Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Clearwater Drive, Yucatan Avenue, Imperial Lane.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Arden Way.

Cross Street 1: Exposition Boulevard, Ethan Way.

Cross Street 2: Arden Way Connector. (Additional)

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Rich G.

Comment: Traffic on Arden travels at 50MPH. That's a fact. This should be a Class 4. I wouldn't ride on Arden if it's not. The sad part is that's my route to Whole Foods and Bel Air.

Rec Likes: 20.

Rec Dislikes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 3.

Net Likes: 16.

Street: Arden Way Connector. (Additional)

Cross Street 1: American River Bike Trail.

Cross Street 2: Arden Way.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: JJ.

Comment: Why? is someone hoping for pavement here?? using the existing path right next to it has been fine for me.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Arno Road.

Cross Street 1: Valensin Ranch Road, East Stockton Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Riley Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Ashton Drive.

Cross Street 1: North River Way.

Cross Street 2: Saverien Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Heidi Satter.

Comment: Very important for the safety of the neighborhood children due to high traffic from the nearby high schools.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Auburn Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Business 80 West bound, Business 80 East bound.

Cross Street 2: Manzanita Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Bannister Road.

Cross Street 1: Bannister Bike Trail.

Cross Street 2: Winding Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Bayou Way.

Cross Street 1: Bayou Road.

Cross Street 2: Airport Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Dan.

Comment: Love the possibility to bike to the airport!/ Approach Woodland more safely.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Beech Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Pershing Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Include a bike signal southbound.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Big Horn Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Franklin Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: This is planned as a buffered class 2 bikeway in the Elk Grove BPTMP. It would continue along Big Horn Blvd to Laguna Blvd.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Bilby Road.

Cross Street 1: Willard Parkway.

Cross Street 2: Bruceville Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: The Elk Grove BPTMP has this as a buffered class 2 bikeway.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Bilby Road.

Cross Street 1: Franklin Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Willard Parkway.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: Elk Grove recommends taking this out. We do not have it in the BPTMP. It is expected that in the long run, the roadway over the UPRR crossing on Bilby will be closed as traffic shifts to a new overcrossing planned on Kammerer Road.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Boessow Road.

Cross Street 1: Marengo Road.

Cross Street 2: Alta Mesa Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Borden Road.

Cross Street 1: Herald Road.

Cross Street 2: Alta Mesa Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Borden Road.

Cross Street 1: Alta Mesa Road.

Cross Street 2: Clay Station Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Bradshaw Road.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Elder Creek Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Bradshaw Road.

Cross Street 1: Elder Creek Road.

Cross Street 2: Calvine Road.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Desperately needed!

Rec Likes: 5.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: Bradshaw Road.

Cross Street 1: Folsom Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Unnamed Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Fayzah.

Comment: My kid's school route: we're transit- dependent and this gives us more options!

Rec Likes: 6.

Comment Likes: 5.

Comment Dislikes: 3.

Net Likes: 8.

Street: Bridge Street.

Cross Street 1: Temescal Street.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Boulevard, Howard Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Bruceville Road.

Cross Street 1: Lambert Road.

Cross Street 2: Twin Cities Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Bruceville Road.

Cross Street 1: Bilby Road.

Cross Street 2: Lambert Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: 90% of the time I don't ride this segment of Bruceville solo because there isn't a designated bike lane. And this is heavily used by commuters and commercial trucks.

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: California Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Kenneth Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Landis Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: California Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Grant Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Sutter Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: California Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Jan Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Calvine Road.

Cross Street 1: Vineyard Road.

Cross Street 2: Grant Line Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: The Elk Grove BPTMP has this as a class 1, from Grant Line Road to Bader Road.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Calvine Road.

Cross Street 1: Highway 99 North bound, Cosumnes River Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Elk Grove Florin Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: In the Elk Grove BPTMP, the class 4 is proposed to continue to Bader Road.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Calvine Road Trail.

Cross Street 1: Bruceville Road.

Cross Street 2: Calvine Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Like this. If over crossing here, it would also make sense to provide a more direct connection/path to East Stockton and thus Tillotson Parkway, since it is the premiere detached path nearest this location.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Canberra Drive.

Cross Street 1: South Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Thornhill Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Cardwell Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Oak Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Golden Gate Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: CCTC Trail.

Cross Street 1: Ketcherside Lane.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: CCTC Trail.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: South Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: The class 1 rail to trail bikeway along here was removed from the City of Elk Grove BPTMP due to a lack of willingness by railroad to provide the right of way. If the county were able to negotiate right of way with the railroad, that could be reconsidered.

Rec Likes: 15.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 14.

Street: Central Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Woodmore Oaks Drive.

Cross Street 2: Santa Juanita Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Chenu Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Morse Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Kings Way, Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Cherokee Lane.
Cross Street 1: Conley Road.
Cross Street 2: Boessow Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Cherry Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Hazel Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Mountain Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Cherry Brook Drive.
Cross Street 1: Colonnade Way.
Cross Street 2: Rushing River Court, New Class 1.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Chestnut Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Pershing Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue, Granite Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Chica Way.

Cross Street 1: Berrendo Drive.

Cross Street 2: Las Pasas Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Chicago Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Winding Way.

Cross Street 2: Yvonne Way, Cozzins Court.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Sue Schooley.

Comment: Chicago dead ends just past Yvonne and is a very narrow rough road, if you add that route you need to continue it to Buena Vista, better option would be to go up Arboleda or Shamrock Drive to Ascolano to Buena Vista which leads you to Madison by BV high school, it’s the Safe Route to School needed for students.

Rec Likes: 2.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Chicago Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Kaula Drive.

Cross Street 2: Madison Avenue, Mckay Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Extend south to the western park entrance to Florin Creek park.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Christensen Road.

Cross Street 1: Twin Cities Road.

Cross Street 2: New Hope Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Clay Station Road.

Cross Street 1: Borden Road.

Cross Street 2: Simmerhorn Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Clay Station Road.

Cross Street 1: McKinley Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Borden Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Clay Station Road.

Cross Street 1: Dillard Road.
Cross Street 2: Twin Cities Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: College Oak Drive.
Cross Street 1: Myrtle Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Madison Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Colonnade Way.
Cross Street 1: Ranch River Drive.
Cross Street 2: Cherry Brook Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Colony Road.
Cross Street 1: Dillard Road.
Cross Street 2: Valensin Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Conley Road.

Cross Street 1: Cherokee Lane.

Cross Street 2: Alta Mesa Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

Cross Street 1: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Core Road.

Cross Street 1: Franklin Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Ed Rau Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Cottage Park Trail.

Cross Street 1: Cottage Way.

Cross Street 2: Morse Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: ND.

Comment: Having a shared use path through Cottage park would be fantastic to create connectivity for the Cottage Elementary School population.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: County Creek Drive.
Cross Street 1: Indian Creek Drive, Country Trail Drive.
Cross Street 2: Country Lake Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Cresthill Drive.
Cross Street 1: Sheldon Lake Drive.
Cross Street 2: Sloughhouse Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Crestview Drive.
Cross Street 1: Winding Way.
Cross Street 2: Jan Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Curragh Downs Drive.
Cross Street 1: Curragh Downs Trail.
Cross Street 2: Hazel Avenue, Visage Circle.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Curragh Downs Trail.

Cross Street 1: Curragh Downs Drive.

Cross Street 2: Illinois Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Awesome -- have to walk the bike now & unusable for people of my ilk after winter rains.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Deer Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Laguna Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Deer Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Laguna Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Janet Rodgers.

Comment: Can't wait to ride this one! We love deer creek hills!

Rec Likes: 9.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 11.

Street: Deer Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Alder Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Presume you're working with the rancher--he was amazingly awesome with Scott Road and rude, untidy bicyclists ruined it. Establish a bike-community liaison/partnership to keep it clean for him.

Rec Likes: 6.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Del Campo Park Trail.

Cross Street 1: Bellue Street, Moraga Drive.

Cross Street 2: Crestview Drive.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Del Paso Road.

Cross Street 1: East Levee Road.

Cross Street 2: Blackrock Drive, Professor Lane.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Kate Burns.

Comment: Definitely needed here especially traveling toward the Charter school. Would be even better to have a Class 2B.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Del Paso Road.
Cross Street 1: Upper Westside New Class 1.
Cross Street 2: Power Line Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Del Paso Road.
Cross Street 1: Euboea Island Lane, Arco Del Paso Lane, Cognac Circle, Paso Centro Lane.
Cross Street 2: Upper Westside New Class 1.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Dewey Drive.
Cross Street 1: Winding Way.
Cross Street 2: Dunmore Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Dillard Road.
Cross Street 1: Jackson Road.
Cross Street 2: Highway 99 North bound.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Douglas Road.
Cross Street 1: Mather Boulevard.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Zach.
Comment: A Class 1 facility to connect Mather Boulevard Trail to Folsom South Canal would encourage more riders and make it a less stressful route.
Rec Likes: 3.
Comment Dislikes: 1.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Dry Creek Trail.
Cross Street 1: Barros Drive.
Cross Street 2: Dry Creek Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 6.
Net Likes: 6.

Street: Dry Creek Trail.
Cross Street 1: U Street, 24th Street.
Cross Street 2: Gibson Ranch Park Road, Gibson Ranch Park Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 7.
Net Likes: 7.

Street: East Levee Road.
Cross Street 1: West Elkhorn Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Nemdec Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: East Stockton Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Stockton Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Meadowhaven Drive, Power Inn Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Eastern Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Whitney Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Edison Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Eastern Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Arden Way.

Cross Street 2: El Camino Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Suzy Murray.

Comment: Increase safety for students going to and from El Camino HS/Choices Charter. Need to account for cars coming out of the Dutch Bros at El Camino and Eastern. Distracted drivers into/out of that parking lot are a hazard to kids coming to/from school.

Rec Likes: 6.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Nimbus Road, Albany Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Nimbus Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Nimbus Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Birkmont Drive.
Cross Street 2: Alder Creek Trail.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Alabama Avenue, Unnamed Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Ed Rau Road.

Cross Street 1: Core Road.

Cross Street 2: Eschinger Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: El Camino Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Connie Drive.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 12.

Net Likes: 12.

Street: El Centro Road.

Cross Street 1: Jumilla Way, Alcantar Circle.

Cross Street 2: Witter Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: This is proposed as a buffered class 2 in the Elk Grove BPTMP.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Elder Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Elk Grove Florin Road.

Cross Street 2: Mack Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Elder Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Waterman Trail.

Cross Street 2: Kiefer Blvd, Mather South, Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1, Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Need signalized crossing at Florin Road and practical route around railroad.

Rec Likes: 8.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 9.

Street: Elk Grove Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: I-5 Southbound.

Cross Street 2: Franklin Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Elk Grove Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Grant Line Road.

Cross Street 2: Center Parkway.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: The Laguna Creek Trail is expected to continue into City of Sac, and County of Sac, connecting somewhere near the light rail station along Cosumnes River Blvd.

Rec Likes: 10.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 12.

Street: Elk Grove Florin Road.

Cross Street 1: South Watt Avenue, Florin Road.

Cross Street 2: Calvine Road.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Elk Grove UPRR Trail.

Cross Street 1: Highway 99 North bound.

Cross Street 2: Elk Grove Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: This segment is now realigned to go south-west to Jeannie McConnell Park at Iron Rock Way.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Elkhorn Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: West Elkhorn Blvd.

Cross Street 2: I-80 West bound Greenback Lane.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Elm Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Almond Hill Court.

Cross Street 2: Main Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Elsie Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Stockton Boulevard, Mack Road.

Cross Street 2: Cottonwood Lane.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Elverta Road.

Cross Street 1: Rio Linda Boulevard, West Elverta Road.

Cross Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Elverta Road, Cherry Brook Drive.

Cross Street 2: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

Cross Street 1: New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Engle Road.

Cross Street 1: Winston Way.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Engle Road.

Cross Street 1: Norris Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Bausell Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Silver Springs Lot P Lot G to Gerber Road. Need to consider class 1 on the western side of Excelsior as alternate Laguna Creek alignment if primary is inhibited.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Eschinger Road.

Cross Street 1: Ed Rau Road.

Cross Street 2: West Stockton Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: Ride south elk grove rural roads 4-5 days a week, which are in poor condition, no shoulder, with increasing levels of traffic(commuter shortcuts).

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Escobar Way Connector.

Cross Street 1: Mira Del Rio Drive, Escobar Way.

Cross Street 2: South American River Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Estates Drive.

Cross Street 1: Crondall Drive.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Ethan Way.

Cross Street 1: Hurley Way.

Cross Street 2: Hurley Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Ethan Way.

Cross Street 1: Arden Way.

Cross Street 2: El Camino Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Ethan Way.

Cross Street 1: Hurley Way.

Cross Street 2: Arden Way, Exposition Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 5.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: Excelsior Road.

Cross Street 1: Kiefer Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Jackson Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Excelsior Road.

Cross Street 1: Jackson Road, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Calvine Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Excelsior Road.

Cross Street 1: Air Tower Road, Park Road, Mather Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Woodring Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Winding Way.

Cross Street 2: Central Avenue, Winding Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Sequoia Circle.

Cross Street 2: Greenback Lane.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Crestline Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Winding Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Pine Garden Lane.

Cross Street 2: Crestline Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 32.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 6.

Net Likes: 37.

Street: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Central Avenue, Winding Way.

Cross Street 2: Sequoia Circle.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Filbert Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Pershing Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Class 2 existing (Florin Mall Drive from Florin to Orange Avenue) thanks to SRPD South of Florin Area Active transportation grant. DOT was an implementing partner and administered the project.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Florin Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Florin Creek Trail.

Cross Street 2: Florin Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Direct nearby class 2 and 3 to use the existing Class 1 path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Florin Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Palmer House Drive.

Cross Street 2: Florin Perkins Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: The portion of this alignment south of Florin Road is blocked by housing and very constrained creek corridor. Need to consider alternate alignments, perhaps under the powerline corridor to move bikes/peds in the short term while maintaining the long-term goal of class 1 connections.
Rec Likes: 2.
Comment Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: Florin Mall Drive.
Cross Street 1: Florin Road.
Cross Street 2: Orange Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Florin Road.
Cross Street 1: Franklin Boulevard.
Cross Street 2: Sunrise Boulevard.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Commenter: DC.
Comment: Please prioritize a freeway crossing here. Currently there are few safe bike/ped crossings over SR-99, and generally no consistent and safe east- west bike/ped routes through south Sacramento.
Rec Likes: 15.
Comment Likes: 3.
Net Likes: 18.

Street: Folsom Boulevard.
Cross Street 1: South Watt Avenue, Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Mira Del Rio Drive.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 9.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 8.

Street: Folsom Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Nimbus Road, Hazel Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Aerojet Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Folsom South Canal Trail.

Cross Street 1: Twin Cities Road.

Cross Street 2: Dillard Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: Adding more miles and connectivity to south county via the Folsom Canal bike/ped path, like it!

Rec Likes: 8.

Net Likes: 8.

Street: Folsom South Canal Trail.

Cross Street 1: Dillard Road.

Cross Street 2: Sloughhouse Road.

Rec Likes: 10.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 9.

Street: Foxfire Drive.

Cross Street 1: Woodlake Hills Drive, Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Trajan Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Franklin Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Willard Parkway.

Cross Street 2: North Thornton Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Marilissa Loera.

Comment: San Joaquin County has a proposed Class 2 Bicycle Lane would provide connection from Sacramento County to San Joaquin County (and vice versa).

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Franklin Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Fruitridge Road.

Cross Street 2: Huss Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Kou Xiong.

Comment: I bike to midtown for work using this path and it would really help knowing I'll be safe from other vehicles.

Rec Likes: 4.

Comment Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Franklin Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: 38th Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Phoenix Park Drive Franklin Boulevard Alley, Creeks Edge Way, East Parkway

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: DC.

Comment: Please prioritize buffered lanes here. Franklin is a great north-south connection, and buffered bike lanes here will connect with existing and planned buffered facilities on the portions of Franklin Boulevard in City of Sacramento.

Rec Likes: 8.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 10.

Street: Freeport Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Freeport Marina.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: This segment north of cosumnes boulevard that isn't class 2 needs to be completed to connect to the bike path in the park and on to the Sac levee bike trail. It's WAAAYYY overdue!

Rec Likes: 5.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: Fruitridge Road.

Cross Street 1: Martin Luther King Junior Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: 53rd Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Anonymous.

Comment: Can this be protected?

Rec Likes: 3.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 4.

Net Likes: Negative 2.

Street: Fulton Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Sierra Boulevard, Munroe Street

Cross Street 2: Auburn Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 15.

Net Likes: 15.

Street: Garden Highway Trail.

Cross Street 1: I-80 East bound.

Cross Street 2: Garden Highway.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Dan.

Comment: I like this, but there needs to be a connection over the bridge to West Sac if there isn't now.

Rec Likes: 12.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 12.

Street: Garden Highway.
Cross Street 1: I-80 East bound.
Cross Street 2: North Bayou Way.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 6.
Net Likes: 6.

Street: Garfield Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Boulevard, Unnamed Road.
Cross Street 2: Greenback Lane, Verner Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: JS.
Comment: Madison Avenue is in great need of repair and modernization. The road base is crumbling. To conceive of adding purpose built bike path is wrong headed. Bicycling on the same corridor is both dangerous (just walking on Madison is dangerous) and unhealthy breathing due to traffic. Bicycling corridors should be placed off major traffic corridors for safety as well as aesthetic considerations.
Rec Likes: 6.
Rec Dislikes: 2.
Comment Dislikes: 1.
Net Likes: 3.

Street: Gary Way.
Cross Street 1: Mcclaren Drive.
Cross Street 2: Arden Way.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Gerber Creek Trail

Cross Street 1: CCTC Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Gerber Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: CCTC Trail.

Cross Street 2: Vineyard Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Need to coordinate alignments and crossings of Gerber Road.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Gerber Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Gerber Road.

Cross Street 2: Florin Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Gerber Road.

Cross Street 1: Stockton Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Elk Grove Florin Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Gerber Road.

Cross Street 1: Bradshaw Road.

Cross Street 2: Excelsior Road, Birch Ranch Drive.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Gibbons Drive.

Cross Street 1: Walnut Avenue, Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 6.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: Gibson Ranch Park Road.

Cross Street 1: Elverta Road.

Cross Street 2: Unnamed Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Gibson Ranch Park Road.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Gibson Ranch Park Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Goethe Road.

Cross Street 1: Rosemont Drive, Mayhew Road.

Cross Street 2: Bradshaw Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Anonymous.

Comment: This street is dangerous for bikers in places, especially as you are nearer to Bradshaw.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Gold Country Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Hazel Avenue.

Cross Street 2: American River Bike Trail.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: shalako.

Comment: When are you going to finish the bike path under the Hazel bridge. I used it all the time. It's much better and safer than trying to cross Hazel at the light.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Gold River Road.

Cross Street 1: Coloma Road.

Cross Street 2: Pyrites Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Golden Gate Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Granite Avenue, Golden Gate Avenue Trail.

Cross Street 2: Cardwell Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Golden Gate Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Hazel Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Golden Gate Avenue Trail.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Golden Gate Avenue Trail.

Cross Street 1: Granite Avenue, Golden Gate Avenue Trail.

Cross Street 2: Golden Gate Avenue Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: West Elkhorn Boulevard.
Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 4.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 4.
Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 4.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 4.
Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 4.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 2.
Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 2.
Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 2.

Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 2.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: East Levee Road.

Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 2, Grandpark New Class 4.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 2, Grandpark New Class 4.

Cross Street 2: East Levee Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 2.

Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 4.
Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 1.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grandpark New Class 4.
Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 1.
Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 1.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Grandpark New Class 4.
Cross Street 1: Grandpark New Class 1.
Cross Street 2: Grandpark New Class 1.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 3.
Net Likes: 3.

Street: Granite Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Oak Avenue, Chestnut Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Cherry Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Granite Avenue Trail.

Cross Street 1: Cherry Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Placer County Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Grant Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Sue Pam Drive.

Cross Street 2: Grant Avenue Trail.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grant Avenue Trail.

Cross Street 1: Autumn Point Lane.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Grant Line Road.

Cross Street 1: White Rock Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Grant Line- White Rock Trail.

Cross Street 1: Mosher Road.

Cross Street 2: White Rock Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared-Use Path.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: To be able to ride to Folsom and beyond starting from elk grove safely would be awesome.

Rec Likes: 11.

Net Likes: 11.

Street: Green Road.

Cross Street 1: Wilton Road.

Cross Street 2: Dillard Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Greenback Lane.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Main Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: YES! Desperately needed.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Greenback Lane.

Cross Street 1: I-80 West bound, Elkhorn Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Sewan Avenue, Yucatan Avenue, Freedom Lane, Declaration Circle, Redcliff Drive.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Hackberry Lane.

Cross Street 1: Cypress Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Nichora Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Harrington Way.

Cross Street 1: American River Bike Trail.

Cross Street 2: Kingsford Drive, American River Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Harvest Falls Drive.

Cross Street 1: Trading Post Court.

Cross Street 2: Ranch River Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Extend to Fruitridge Community Park. There is a pool, community center, and SETA Head Start daycare at this park where children play and are engaged in after school and summer programs. Continue through the park to link to MLK Blvd.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Hazel Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Madison Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Hazel Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Folsom Boulevard, Nimbus Road.
Cross Street 2: American River Bike Trail.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Hazel Avenue.
Cross Street 1: American River Bike Trail.
Cross Street 2: Madison Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Hazel Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Oak Avenue.
Cross Street 2: West Ranch Drive.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Hickory Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Oak Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Indian Hill Court.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Hobday Road.
Cross Street 1: Colony Road.
Cross Street 2: Folsom South Canal Trail.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Hood Franklin Road.
Cross Street 1: River Road, 2nd Street, Sacramento River Trail.
Cross Street 2: Franklin Boulevard.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Mark Elliott.
Comment: The segment from franklin to I-5 has 50% no shoulder, 50% crap shoulder filled with broken glass and debris guaranteed to puncture bike tires. 50+ mph traffic heavy at commute times. Class 2 is welcome!
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: Howe Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Marconi Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 15.

Comment Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 18.

Street: Hurley Way.

Cross Street 1: Oak Terrace Court.

Cross Street 2: Crisp Court, Rowena Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Hurley Way.

Cross Street 1: Ethan Way.

Cross Street 2: Dealynn Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Highway 160.

Cross Street 1: State Highway 12.

Cross Street 2: Sherman Island East Levee Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Matt.

Comment: Great to see this in the plan, so needed!

Rec Likes: 4.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Highway 160.

Cross Street 1: Sutter Slough Bridge Road, Courtland Bridge.

Cross Street 2: Walnut Grove Bridge.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: I-5 Trail.

Cross Street 1: Kausen Drive.

Cross Street 2: I-5 North bound.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: 150% in favor of any alternative that eliminates the need to run the gauntlet of Cosumnes River Boulevard to Franklin to Freeport via bike. I ride 2-300 miles a week & have had or seen while driving too many close calls particularly at I-5 or the light rail bridge sidewalk. (most cyclists use the 10 feet wide. (why???) As evidence see Google Earth and count cars directly adjacent

or in the bike lane in both directions, 15 of 57 by my count, non-peak. Live in Elk Grove & want a safe bike route to downtown & ARBT!

Rec Likes: 10.

Net Likes: 10.

Street: I-5 Trail Connector.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: I-5 Trail

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: I-5 Trail Connector.

Cross Street 1: I-5 Trail.

Cross Street 2: Freeport Blvd, Sacramento River Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 6.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: Illinois Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Pershing Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Include paving (really rough ride) & bike signals both directions at Madison.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Indian Creek Drive.

Cross Street 1: Country Creek Drive, Country Trail Drive.

Cross Street 2: Indian Hill Court.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Indian Hill Court.

Cross Street 1: Indian Creek Drive.

Cross Street 2: Hickory Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Iona Way.

Cross Street 1: Elsie Avenue, Darla Way.

Cross Street 2: Leilani Court.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Isleton-Stone Lakes Trail.

Cross Street 1: Corodon Street, Grove Street, Lord Street, C Street, Tyler Street.

Cross Street 2: Sacramento River Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: This would make Walnut Grove, Isleton and Rio Vista and this route a tourist destination for cyclists.

Rec Likes: 19.

Net Likes: 19.

Street: Jackson Road.

Cross Street 1: Excelsior Road, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Eagles Nest Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Jackson Road.

Cross Street 1: Eagles Nest Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Dan.

Comment: Separation from the incredibly fast traffic would be great.

Rec Likes: 9.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 10.

Street: Jackson Road.

Cross Street 1: Thornhill Drive.

Cross Street 2: Excelsior Road, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Jackson Slough Road.
Cross Street 1: Terminous Road.
Cross Street 2: State Highway 12.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Matt.
Comment: This is great but it really needs to be extended along Jackson Slough south of Highway 12, then along Brannan Island Road heading east.
Rec Likes: 1.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Jacob Lane.
Cross Street 1: Dovercourt Circle, Sherlock Way.
Cross Street 2: American River Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Jan Drive.
Cross Street 1: Ranger Way, Jan Drive Trail.
Cross Street 2: California Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Jan Drive.
Cross Street 1: Winding Way.
Cross Street 2: Crestview Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Kammerer Bikeway.

Cross Street 1: Highway 99 North bound.

Cross Street 2: I-5 North bound.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: This would add a faster route to get east of 99(bike) & reduce traffic on Eschinger. Car speed will be 50+ i'm guessing so nice fat, "fatter" than 4 feet, would be appreciated!!! Fingers crossed since I am aware this road is currently being reconstructed.

Rec Likes: 7.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Kammerer Road.

Cross Street 1: Bruceville Road.

Cross Street 2: Promenade Parkway, Grant Line Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Carrie Whitlock.

Comment: The Elk Grove BPTMP has this as a buffered class 2 bike Lane from Bruceville Road to Lent Ranch Parkway.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Kaula Drive.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Cross Street 2: Chicago Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: One of my favorite back roads!

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Kenneth Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Mission Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Boulevard.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Kenneth Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Winding Way.

Cross Street 2: Greenback Lane.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Include bike signals at Greenback & fix the oak tree problem just south of Greenback--DANGEROUS lack of visibility.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Kenosha Road.

Cross Street 1: Nimbus Road, Albany Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Louisiana Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Kiefer Boulevard.

Cross Street 1: Bradshaw Road, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Kiefer Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Rosemont Drive.

Cross Street 2: Thornhill Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Kiefer Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Reith Court.

Cross Street 2: Rosemont Drive.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Kiefer Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Thornhill Drive.

Cross Street 2: Bradshaw Road, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Kings Way.

Cross Street 1: Chenu Avenue, Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Marilona Drive, Maryal Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Kost Road.

Cross Street 1: New Hope Road, Orr Road.

Cross Street 2: Tudor Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: L Street Trail.

Cross Street 1: L Street.

Cross Street 2: L Street.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: La Serena Drive.

Cross Street 1: Hazel Avenue.

Cross Street 2: L Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: La Sierra Drive.

Cross Street 1: La Brea Way.

Cross Street 2: Arden Way, Maple Glen Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Heritage Hill Drive, Bamarcia Drive, Devon Crest Way.

Cross Street 2: Crystal Creek Drive, Fillies Court.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Juan Chavez.

Comment: Where does the south/west end of this trail segment terminate? It appears to be near a park site, but it's not clear if it connects to anything in particular.

Rec Likes: 6.

Comment Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Saddle Creek Drive.

Cross Street 2: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Paul Myers.

Comment: Thank you for adding an East-West bike/pedestrian only route that avoids autos on high speed streets/highways. When will it be completed?
Rec Likes: 10.
Comment Likes: 1.
Comment Dislikes: 2.
Net Likes: 9.

Street: Laguna Creek Trail.
Cross Street 1: Grant Line- White Rock Trail.
Cross Street 2: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 6.
Net Likes: 6.

Street: Laguna Creek Trail.
Cross Street 1: Deer Creek Trail.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 8.
Net Likes: 8.

Street: Lambert Road.
Cross Street 1: River Road.
Cross Street 2: Bruceville Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Anonymous.
Comment: Lambert east of I-5 has no shoulder, crap surface, with increasing traffic. A dream come true if this were to be made Class 2.
Rec Likes: 5.
Net Likes: 5.

Street: Latrobe Road.

Cross Street 1: Indio Drive, Jackson Road.

Cross Street 2: Michigan Bar Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Lemon Hill Avenue.

Cross Street 1: 44th Street, 41st Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Stockton Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: They is a Boys and Girls Club here off 47th. Bike and pedestrian access should be improved beyond shared Class 3.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Lincoln Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Manzanita Avenue.

Cross Street 2: San Juan Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Locust Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Walnut Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Manzanita Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Lone Tree Road.

Cross Street 1: Meister Way, North Bayou Way.

Cross Street 2: West Elverta Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Longview Drive.

Cross Street 1: Roseville Road.

Cross Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Los Molinos Way.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Cross Street 2: La Sierra Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: kelli m wheeler.

Comment: Not safe to get across Fair Oaks to American River bike trail. Should be San Ramon to Wilhaggin where there is a light. Then across American River Drive to Crondall. Crondall to Estates to river access.

Rec Likes: 2.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: M Street.

Cross Street 1: Sun Brae Court, West M Street.

Cross Street 2: Oak Lane.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Kenneth.

Comment: This street would be great for a complete street concept. Roadway is wide and can accommodate striping for bike lanes, parking. Roadway is approximately 40 feet wide. Two 10 foot travel lanes, 6 foot parking, 5 foot bike lanes. (10+10+6+6+5+5=42 feet.)

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Madison Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Roseville Road, Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Greenback Lane, Lake Natoma Drive.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Cy.

Comment: This is a very busy major road. Ideally, more street lights would be ideal to present a more "safer" feel to the road.

Rec Likes: 9.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 11.

Street: Main Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Greenback Lane.
Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue, Mountain Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: ida.
Comment: This should extend all the way over the 80 overpass. I have walked there with a stroller before and it is dangerous. There is not a safe way to get across and the sidewalk is very narrow and very high off the ground. there is not room for 2 people to walk next to each other. High traffic and narrow lanes.
Rec Likes: 2.
Comment Likes: 1.
Comment Dislikes: 1.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Manzanita Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Auburn Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 3.
Net Likes: 3.

Street: Marconi Ave .
Cross Street 1: Walnut Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd, Palm Drive.
Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Marconi Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Howe Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Walnut Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 14.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 13.

Street: Marilona Drive.

Cross Street 1: Kings Way, Maryal Drive.

Cross Street 2: Marconi Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Suzy Murray.

Comment: Better bike infrastructure is sorely needed near Del Paso Manor Elem. school, but needs to connect to improved, safer walking/biking infrastructure on nearby main, busy streets. Many families walk/bike their kids to DPM, and morning rush hour traffic on Marconi, El Camino, and Eastern makes for dangerous walking and biking. Any improvements in sidewalks/bike lanes really need to be part of an overall strategy to improve kids' safe routes to school.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Marlynn Street.

Cross Street 1: Perth Way.

Cross Street 2: Stanley Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Marshall Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Stanley Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Grant Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mather Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Douglas Road.

Cross Street 2: Air Tower Road, Park Road, Excelsior Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Mayhew Drain Trail.

Cross Street 1: Mayhew Road.

Cross Street 2: South American River Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Mcclaren Drive.

Cross Street 1: Shelato Way.

Cross Street 2: Arden Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mckay Street.

Cross Street 1: Madison Avenue, Chicago Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Treecrest Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mckinley Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Twin Cities Road.
Cross Street 2: Clay Station Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Meadowhaven Drive.
Cross Street 1: East Stockton Blvd, Power Inn Road.
Cross Street 2: Pixley Way.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mercantile Drive Connector.
Cross Street 1: Salisbury Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Michigan Bar Road.
Cross Street 1: Latrobe Road.
Cross Street 2: Jackson Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Micron Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Huntsman Drive, Mayhew Road.

Cross Street 2: US 50 East bound.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Mills Road.

Cross Street 1: Huntington Road.

Cross Street 2: Drake Circle.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: ND.

Comment: This would be a great addition to Mills Road as it would make bicycling to and from the area schools safer.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

Cross Street 1: Hyannis Way, South American River Trail.

Cross Street 2: Paseo Rio Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

Cross Street 1: Folsom Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Escobar Way, Escobar Way Connector.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mirandy Drive.

Cross Street 1: Huntsman Drive.

Cross Street 2: Mayhew Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Mission Avenue.

Cross Street 1: El Camino Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Engle Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Suzy Murray.

Comment: increases safety for students to El Camino HS and Choice Charter School.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Montclaire Street.

Cross Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Whitney Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Moraga Drive.

Cross Street 1: Jan Drive.

Cross Street 2: Dewey Drive, Papaya Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

Cross Street 1: Franklin Blvd, A Pkwy.

Cross Street 2: Burdett Way.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: There is an existing bike/ped crossing of Morrison Creek between Candell Court and Sky Pkwy. Please add to the map and build into the network.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes:1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Morse Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Sierra Blvd, Northrop Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Morse Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Arden Way.

Cross Street 2: Alta Arden Expressway.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Morse Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Cottage Park Trail.

Cross Street 2: El Camino Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Morse Avenue.

Cross Street 1: El Camino Avenue, Drayton Drive.

Cross Street 2: Marconi Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Morse Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Auburn Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Mountain Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Oak Avenue, Main Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Cherry Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Myrtle Avenue.

Cross Street 1: I-80 East bound.

Cross Street 2: College Oak Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Myrtle Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Roseville Road.

Cross Street 2: Harrison Street.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: North Bayou Way.

Cross Street 1: Crossfield Drive.

Cross Street 2: Garden Highway.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: North Market Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Northgate Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Arena Blvd, Gateway Park Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: National Drive.

Cross Street 1: Del Paso Road.

Cross Street 2: North Market Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Marilissa Loera.

Comment: San Joaquin County's Bicycle Master Plan Update does not have a planned connecting Bicycle Lane on New Hope Road. There is a proposed Buffered Bicycle Lane along Thornton Road.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Navaho Drive.

Cross Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Blackfoot Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Nemdec Trail.
Cross Street 1: West Elkhorn Blvd.
Cross Street 2: West Elverta Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Cherry Brook Drive.
Cross Street 2: 16th Street, Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: 16th Street, Road A.
Cross Street 2: 9th Street.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.
Cross Street 2: El Modena Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.
Cross Street 2: 16th Street, Road A.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: New Class 1 Connector.
Cross Street 1: Left blank.
Cross Street 2: Harvest Falls Drive.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Commenter: GEORGE BROAD.
Comment: This would be great for me. I wouldn't have to ride on Elverta Road and 28th Street to get to the bike path any more! Can't wait.
Rec Likes: 5.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 6.

Street: New Hope Road.
Cross Street 1: North New Hope Road.
Cross Street 2: Kost Road, Orr Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Mark Elliott.
Comment: no shoulder and high speed 60+ make this a sketchy route, class 2 would definitely help, Kost included. Well travelled by Galt commuters.
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: New Hope Road.

Cross Street 1: Orr Road.

Cross Street 2: Turnace Court.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Sunrise Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Sunrise Blvd, Laguna Creek Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Eagles Nest Road, Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 2.

Cross Street 2: Eagles Nest Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Kiefer Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Newbury Way.
Cross Street 1: Shelfield Drive.
Cross Street 2: Claremont Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Norris Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Clairidge Way.
Cross Street 2: Auburn Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: North Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Mission Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: North Pkwy.
Cross Street 1: Sky Pkwy.
Cross Street 2: Steiner Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Northgate Blvd.

Cross Street 1: North Freeway Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Del Paso Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Northrop Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Enterprise Drive.

Cross Street 2: Howe Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Oak Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Kenneth Avenue, Wachtel Way.

Cross Street 2: Santa Juanita Avenue, Oak Avenue Parkway.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Oak Avenue Pkwy.

Cross Street 1: Santa Juanita Avenue, Oak Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Marsalla Drive.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Old Winding Way.

Cross Street 1: Old Winding Way.

Cross Street 2: Old Winding Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Oleander Drive Connection.

Cross Street 1: Oleander Drive.

Cross Street 2: Del Campo Park Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Orr Road.

Cross Street 1: New Hope Road, Kost Road.

Cross Street 2: Sparrow Drive, West Elm Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Out Of Scope—Within City Limit.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Fulton Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Out Of Scope—Within City Limit.

Cross Street 1: Wachtel Way.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd, Shimmer River Lane.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Oxbow Drive.

Cross Street 1: Tyler Island Bridge Road.

Cross Street 2: Terminous Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Alexa Mergen.

Comment: This is a beautiful stretch of road.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Oxwood Drive.

Cross Street 1: Tallyho Drive.

Cross Street 2: Roseport Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Austin Allen.

Comment: I use this road to get to Mayhew/ Rancho from here, route signage to encourage this route to mayhew would be good.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Palm Drive.

Cross Street 1: California Avenue.

Cross Street 2: San Lorenzo Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Palmer House Drive.

Cross Street 1: Skander Way.

Cross Street 2: Gerber Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Pasadena Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Cypress Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Auburn Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Benjamin Etgen.

Comment: This has another of the County's many notorious slip ways! Nothing is worse for pedestrians and cyclists. Even signal controlled traffic making a left turn with a green aspect has to stop for traffic making a right turn against a red aspect!

Rec Likes: 7.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 8.

Street: Pasadena Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Auburn Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Edison Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: Paseo Rio Way.
Cross Street 1: Mira Del Rio Drive.
Cross Street 2: Horn Road, Folsom Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Patrol Road.
Cross Street 1: Recreation Way, 32nd Street.
Cross Street 2: Patrol Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Pecan Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Pershing Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Elm Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Include a bike/pedestrian crossing at Greenback.

Rec Likes: 3.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Pennsylvania Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Sacramento Bar Beach Access.

Cross Street 2: Magnolia Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: The levee on the north side of Florin Creek may provide an off-street option to connect to the good work the City is doing along Franklin Blvd and access to Franklin Boyce Park.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Pershing Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Kenneth Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Illinois Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Pershing Avenue Trail

Cross Street 1: American River Bike Trail.

Cross Street 2: Snipes Blvd, Twin Lakes Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Petite Creek Drive.
Cross Street 1: Country Lake Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Phoenix Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Illinois Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Runway Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Cordelia Min.
Comment: Add a light at Hazel or too dangerous to cross.
Rec Likes: 1.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Phoenix Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Kenneth Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Illinois Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Phoenix Park Trail.
Cross Street 1: Groff Drive.
Cross Street 2: Sunset Avenue, Runway Drive.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Placer County Trail.

Cross Street 1: Santa Juanita Trail.

Cross Street 2: Wpa Powerline Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 7.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Placer Mine Connector.

Cross Street 1: American River Bike Trail.

Cross Street 2: Placer Mine Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Zach.

Comment: This would be a great new connection to the American River Bike Trail.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Placerville Road Trail.

Cross Street 1: Payen Road.

Cross Street 2: US 50 East bound.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Katie.

Comment: Not a fan of shared-use paths because too many walkers are clueless and don't single up.

Rec Likes: 7.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Pope Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Fulton Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Watt Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Jim Shannon.
Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.
Rec Likes: 3.
Net Likes: 3.

Street: Power Inn Road.
Cross Street 1: Lorin Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Geneva Pointe Drive.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Power Line Road.
Cross Street 1: Garden Highway.
Cross Street 2: West Elverta Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: Prairie City Road.
Cross Street 1: US 50 East bound.

Cross Street 2: White Rock Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Pyrites Way.

Cross Street 1: Gold River Road.

Cross Street 2: Amalgam Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Q Street.

Cross Street 1: 18th Street.

Cross Street 2: Watt Avenue, Bainbridge Drive.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Q Street Trail.

Cross Street 1: Marysville Blvd, West Q Street.

Cross Street 2: Nemdec Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Race Track Road.

Cross Street 1: River Road, Walnut Grove-Thornton Road.

Cross Street 2: Tyler Island Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Rampart Drive.

Cross Street 1: Winding Way.

Cross Street 2: Barrett Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Ranch River Drive.

Cross Street 1: Colonnade Way.

Cross Street 2: Harvest Falls Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Rimwood Drive.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Elkhorn Blvd.

Cross Street 2: U Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

Cross Street 1: West Elverta Road, Elwyn Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Pleasant Grove Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Ascot Avenue Trail.

Cross Street 2: Elkhorn Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Rising Road.

Cross Street 1: Alta Mesa Road.

Cross Street 2: Tavernor Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: River Oak Way

Cross Street 1: Classic Place.

Cross Street 2: Sarah Court.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: River Road.

Cross Street 1: 2nd Street.

Cross Street 2: Walnut Grove-Thornton Road, Race Track Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 8.

Net Likes: 8.

Street: Robertson Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Mission Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Rich G.

Comment: Why the gap between Eastern and Mission on Robertson Avenue?

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Robertson Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Eastern Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Rich G.

Comment: Why the gap between Eastern and Mission on Robertson Avenue?

Rec Likes: 1.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Robla Creek Trail.
Cross Street 1: Channing Drive, Watt Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Elkhorn Trail.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Roseport Way.
Cross Street 1: Oxwood Drive.
Cross Street 2: Mayhew Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Commenter: Austin Allen.
Comment: I use this road to get to Mayhew/ Rancho from here, route signage to encourage this route to mayhew would be good.
Rec Likes: 1.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Roseville Road.
Cross Street 1: Daly Avenue, Antelope Road.
Cross Street 2: Imran Woods Circle.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Dan.
Comment: I was trying to find a way to bike easily to/from the light rail to Sierra College Auto Fair in Rocklin, and gave up after a couple hours of researching different possibilities.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Roseville Road.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Unnamed Road, Madison Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Routier Trail.

Cross Street 1: Jackson Road.

Cross Street 2: Old Placerville Road, Routier Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: South Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Jackson Road.

Cross Street 2: Florin Road, Elk Grove Florin Road.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Cordelia Min.

Comment: Desperately needed!

Rec Likes: 5.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: South Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Watt Avenue, Folsom Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Jackson Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Mellissa Meng.

Comment: This section of roadway has very fast traffic and no other good options to avoid it. Many students would take this to get to Rosemont High School and Einstein. It is also a continuation of the significant investment of bikeway across the freeway and river and would go a long way to improving the whole corridor for cyclists and walkers.

Rec Likes: 6.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Sacramento Northern Trail.

Cross Street 1: Elverta Road.

Cross Street 2: Los Garcias Lane, Rio Linda Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Sacramento River Trail.

Cross Street 1: Hood Franklin Road, River Road, 2nd Street.

Cross Street 2: Freeport Marina.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Dan.

Comment: Currently this is only a couple-inch wide shoulder. I hope this will be expanded.

Rec Likes: 16.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 18.

Street: Sailor Bar Trail.
Cross Street 1: Sailor Bar Trail.
Cross Street 2: Sailor Bar Trail.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 8.
Rec Dislikes: 1.
Net Likes: 7.

Street: San Juan Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Madison Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Sand Bar Circle .
Cross Street 1: River Walk Way.
Cross Street 2: Los Rios Drive, American River Drive, Mcclaren Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Santa Anita Park Trail.
Cross Street 1: Hernando Road.
Cross Street 2: Bell Street.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Central Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Dowd Court.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Oak Avenue Pkwy, Oak Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Dowd Court.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Santa Juanita Trail.

Cross Street 1: Oak Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Placer County Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Sarah Court.
Cross Street 1: Boyer Drive.
Cross Street 2: River Oak Way.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Saverien Drive.
Cross Street 1: American River Drive.
Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd, Wilhaggin Park Lane.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Heidi Satter.
Comment: Very important here for the high school students!
Rec Likes: 1.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Scott Road.
Cross Street 1: White Rock Road.
Cross Street 2: Latrobe Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Katie.
Comment: But a protected Lane would be better.
Rec Likes: 7.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 8.

Street: Sheldon Lake Drive.

Cross Street 1: Grant Line Road, Sunrise Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Cresthill Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Shelfield Drive.

Cross Street 1: Carmelo Drive.

Cross Street 2: Newbury Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Sierra Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Howe Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Morse Avenue, Northrop Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Simmerhorn Road.

Cross Street 1: Palm Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Clay Station Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Continue [class] 2 or 3 to pedestrian crossing of creek.

Rec Likes: 2.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Sky Pkwy.

Cross Street 1: North Pkwy.

Cross Street 2: 65th Street.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Sloughhouse Road.

Cross Street 1: Jackson Road.

Cross Street 2: Grant Line Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: South American River Trail.

Cross Street 1: Mira Del Rio Drive.

Cross Street 2: Escobar Way Connector.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: South American River Trail.

Cross Street 1: Escobar Way Connector.

Cross Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Dan.

Comment: I like this but it's very difficult to access from the neighborhood; access is currently a locked gate in someone's backyard.

Rec Likes: 12.

Rec Dislikes: 2.

Comment Likes: 2.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 11.

Street: Stanley Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Marshall Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: State Highway 12.

Cross Street 1: Hwy 160.

Cross Street 2: Brannan Island Road, Kettleman Lane.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Alexa Mergen.

Comment: Please extend the bike Lane south on Jackson Slough as well, to Brannan Island Road.

Rec Likes: 4.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Stevenson Avenue.

Cross Street 1: East Stockton Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Cottonwood Lane, Birch Hollow Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Stewart Road.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Arden Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Stockton Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Riza Avenue.

Cross Street 2: East Stockton Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Stockton Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Young Street.

Cross Street 2: 55th Street, 39th Avenue, Mcmahon Drive, 40th Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Stockton Blvd.

Cross Street 1: 14th Avenue.

Cross Street 2: 21st Avenue, Perry Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 6.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Stone Lakes Refuge Trail.

Cross Street 1: Sacramento River Trail.

Cross Street 2: Elk Grove Blvd, I-5 North bound.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Mark Elliott.

Comment: Makes it shorter/easier to get to West Sac/Clarksburg and an open space ride in Stone Lakes.

Rec Likes: 8.

Net Likes: 8.

Street: Stonehouse Road.

Cross Street 1: Latrobe Road.

Cross Street 2: Jackson Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Sue Pam Drive.
Cross Street 1: Whitney Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Grant Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Sunrise Blvd.
Cross Street 1: Jackson Road.
Cross Street 2: Sheldon Lake Drive, Grant Line Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Sunrise Blvd.
Cross Street 1: Coloma Road.
Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 3.
Net Likes: 3.

Street: Sunrise Blvd.
Cross Street 1: Loisdale Way, Dionysus Way.
Cross Street 2: Jackson Road.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Sunrise Blvd.
Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Madison Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 2.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 3.

Street: Sunrise Boulevard Trail.
Cross Street 1: Folsom Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Citrus Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Commenter: shalako.
Comment: Please get the bums out from under the bridge and along the path between 50 and Coloman. It makes it pretty scary riding through there.
Rec Likes: 2.
Comment Dislikes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Sunset Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Isabella Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Main Avenue, Unnamed Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Cordelia Min.
Comment: Do some work with property owners who have overgrown foliage or sloped yards eroding onto the bike trail (seems especially prevalent when

property BACKS to the street (unaware?), but one has a HUGE oleander hedge which is usually taking up 1/2 or more of the existing bike lane.

Rec Likes: 4.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Sutter Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Hollister Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Tallyho Drive.

Cross Street 1: Kiefer Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Kiefer Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Austin Allen.

Comment: This road sees heavy bike/stroller usage, class 2 would be great here.

Rec Likes: 2.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Teichert Conveyor Trail.

Cross Street 1: Kiefer Blvd, West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Folsom Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 7.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Terminous Road.
Cross Street 1: Jackson Slough Road.
Cross Street 2: Oxbow Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Trajan Drive.
Cross Street 1: Greenback Lane.
Cross Street 2: Central Avenue.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Tuckeroo Way.
Cross Street 1: Gum Ranch Drive.
Cross Street 2: Treecrest Avenue, High Hill Way.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Turnbridge Drive.
Cross Street 1: Franklin Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Chevy Chase Way.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Twin Cities Road.
Cross Street 1: River Road.
Cross Street 2: West Stockton Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Anonymous.
Comment: Add a bicycle facility into Rancho Seco Recreation Area.
Rec Likes: 2.
Comment Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 3.

Street: Twin Cities Road.
Cross Street 1: Marengo Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Mark Elliott.
Comment: Like this but this is a 65+ mph highway with commercial vehicles, not sure that 4-foot wide class 2 is sufficient.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Tyler Island Bridge Road.
Cross Street 1: Tyler Island Road.
Cross Street 2: Hwy 160.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Chris.
Comment: It would be great if Isleton's 6th street could be completed to connect the city with Tyler Island Bridge Road.
Rec Likes: 3.
Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Tyler Island Road.
Cross Street 1: Race Track Road.
Cross Street 2: Tyler Island Bridge Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: Unnamed Road.
Cross Street 1: Power Line Road.
Cross Street 2: Crossfield Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Unnamed Road.
Cross Street 1: Tarshes Drive.
Cross Street 2: San Lorenzo Way.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: Unnamed Road.
Cross Street 1: Olive Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Sailor Bar Trail.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Upper Westside New Class 2.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Upper Westside New Class 2.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: El Centro Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Upper Westside New Class 2.
Cross Street 2: Upper Westside New Class 2.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: Upper Westside New Class 2.
Cross Street 2: El Centro Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: El Centro Road.
Cross Street 2: San Juan Road.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 4.
Net Likes: 4.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.
Cross Street 1: San Juan Road.
Cross Street 2: Witter Way.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Witter Way.

Cross Street 2: Bayou Way.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 8.

Net Likes: 8.

Street: Valensin Road.

Cross Street 1: Colony Road.

Cross Street 2: Alta Mesa Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Valensin Road.

Cross Street 1: Arno Road.

Cross Street 2: Colony Road, North Valensin Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Van Alstine Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Cross Street 2: California Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Kenneth.

Comment: This area is a flood plain area. Not much growth would be expected in this area. Can you still provide bike lanes?

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 0.

Street: Verner Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Walnut Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Garfield Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Vineyard Road.

Cross Street 1: Gerber Road.

Cross Street 2: Calvine Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: West Delano Street.

Cross Street 1: Delano Street, Eloise Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Elwyn Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Elkhorn Blvd.

Cross Street 1: Elkhorn Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: West Elverta Road.
Cross Street 1: Left blank.
Cross Street 2: Garden Hwy.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Elverta Road.
Cross Street 1: Elverta Road, Rio Linda Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Sorento Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Elverta Road.
Cross Street 1: East Levee Road.
Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Walmort Road.
Cross Street 1: Dillard Road.
Cross Street 2: Alta Mesa Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Walnut Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Madison Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Oak Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)
Comment: Need pedestrian intersection/signal where class 1 crosses Vintage to access Community & Aquatic Center.
Rec Likes: 2.
Comment Dislikes: 2.
Net Likes: 0.

Street: Walnut Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Palm Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Verner Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Walnut Avenue.
Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Raleigh Way.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.
Commenter: Suzy Murray.
Comment: As with all bike lanes/bike infrastructure, the lanes need to actually be safe. Unprotected bike lanes on busy streets are not reassuring. Drivers weave in and out of bike lanes, and bicyclists in bike lanes are still victims of vehicle accidents. Unless the bike lanes offer some level of safety from cars, I can't see them getting broadly used.

Rec Likes: 7.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Walnut Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Winding Way.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 8.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 7.

Street: Walnut Grove Thornton Road.

Cross Street 1: River Road, Race Track Road.

Cross Street 2: Old Walnut Grove Thornton Road, Walnut Grove Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Waterman Trail.

Cross Street 1: Cctc Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Continue southeast (see County approved Singh Estates) to cross railroad at Gerber and connect to existing path around the detention basin.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 1: South Watt Avenue, Folsom Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Pope Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 25.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 7.

Net Likes: 31.

Street: Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Lynne Way.

Cross Street 2: Spruce Ridge Way, Uphill Way.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Commenter: Dan.

Comment: Great to have bike Lane to/from busses and light rail.

Rec Likes: 11.

Comment Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 14.

Street: Watt Avenue Paseo Trail.

Cross Street 1: Freedom Park Drive.

Cross Street 2: U Street.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Florin Road.

Cross Street 2: Knox Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Commenter: Vincent King. (SRPD)

Comment: Practically speaking this will likely follow a different path, but the intent is to like the Elder and Gerber Creek trails.

Rec Likes: 1.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Elder Creek Road.

Cross Street 2: South Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Teichert Conveyor Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Tree View Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Bradshaw Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Knox Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 2: Tree View Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Bradshaw Road.

Cross Street 2: Mayhew Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Mayhew Road.

Cross Street 2: South Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Zinfandel Drive.

Cross Street 2: Excelsior Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: South Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Mayhew Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Teichert Conveyor Trail.

Cross Street 2: Kiefer Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Excelsior Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Teichert Conveyor Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Kiefer Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Excelsior Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Kiefer Blvd.

Cross Street 2: Happy Lane, Routier Trail.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Kiefer Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Westcamp Road.

Cross Street 1: Left blank.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: White Rock Road.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: White Rock Trail.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: White Rock Trail.

Cross Street 1: Grant Line- White Rock Trail.

Cross Street 2: White Rock Road.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Whitney Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Morse Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Jim Shannon.

Comment: I am generally in favor of bike lanes in the Arden-Arcade area so I can commute safely to work from Land Park.

Rec Likes: 5.

Net Likes: 5.

Street: Whitney Avenue.

Cross Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Sue Pam Drive.

Bikeway Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Dax-Conroy Gayle.

Comment: There are no bike lanes, sidewalks to be shared when walking/ riding on Whitney Avenue between Garfield and Sue Pam/ Grant. Not safe at all.

Rec Likes: 7.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Comment Likes: 4.

Net Likes: 10.

Street: Wildridge Drive.

Cross Street 1: Primrose Drive.

Cross Street 2: Rimwood Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Wilton Road.

Cross Street 1: Grant Line Road.

Cross Street 2: Dillard Road.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Winding Creek Road.

Cross Street 1: Watt Avenue, Cottage Way.

Cross Street 2: Cathay Way.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

Commenter: kelli m wheeler.

Comment: Why not continue this BB up Maple Glenn to La Sierra and then to San Ramon/ Wilhaggin to get across busy Arden and Fair Oaks? Then there is a stop sign to get across American River Drive to Crondall to Estates to American River bike trail.

Rec Likes: 5.

Comment Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 4.

Street: Winding Way.

Cross Street 1: Auburn Blvd.

Cross Street 2: College Oak Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 3.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Winding Way.

Cross Street 1: Pennsylvania Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Winding Way.

Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd, Central Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Hazel Avenue.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Angela.

Comment: While there is a bicycle Lane here it is not kept up well and not wide enough in some areas. What is the plan for keeping it up?

Rec Likes: 5.

Comment Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 6.

Street: Winding Way.

Cross Street 1: Walnut Avenue.

Cross Street 2: Dewey Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Ali Doerr Westbrook.

Comment: The vehicle speeds are very high on this street. I'm concerned that a basic bike Lane won't encourage folks to ride. Please consider lowering speeds and doing traffic calming as well if you decide to go with a class 2.

Rec Likes: 4.

Rec Dislikes: 1.

Net Likes: 3.

Street: Winona Way/ U P R R Crossing.

Cross Street 1: Roseville Road, Winona Way.

Cross Street 2: Dudley Way, Dudley Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Wittenham Way.

Cross Street 1: Greenback Lane.

Cross Street 2: Woodlake Hills Drive.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Rec Likes: 1.

Net Likes: 1.

Street: Woodlake Hills Drive.
Cross Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Cross Street 2: Unnamed Road, Foxfire Drive.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
Rec Likes: 2.
Net Likes: 2.

Street: Woodmore Oaks Drive.
Cross Street 1: Central Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: Woods Road.
Cross Street 1: Colony Road.
Cross Street 2: Alta Mesa Road.
Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.
Rec Likes: 1.
Net Likes: 1.

Street: WPA Powerline Trail.
Cross Street 1: Hazel Avenue.
Cross Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Bikeway Class: Shared- Use Path.
Rec Likes: 7.
Net Likes: 7.

Street: Zinfandel Drive.

Cross Street 1: Douglas Road.

Cross Street 2: Eagles Nest Road, Kiefer Blvd.

Bikeway Class: Bicycle Lane.

Commenter: Paul Myers.

Comment: Please path the gravel section. Thank you!

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Street: Zinfandel Drive.

Cross Street 1: Unnamed Road.

Cross Street 2: Douglas Road.

Bikeway Class: Separated Bikeway.

Rec Likes: 2.

Net Likes: 2.

Appendix C: Project Recommendations and Prioritization:

Chapter cover shows a stretch of road, with two vehicles about to drive off at a green light, and two pedestrians walking along the sidewalk in the far distance.

Introduction:

This sections presents an approach for prioritizing the list of active transportation projects that will be identified countywide. This approach includes a summary of the prioritization process, identification of preliminary prioritization categories, and review of the proposed criteria used for scoring of each category. A brief overview of additional factors that can affect the programming of projects for implementation after prioritization has been finalized are presented at the end of this memorandum. These questions include a discussion of how equity and Environmental Justice Communities should be considered.

The type of project will affect the prioritization process. For example, bicycle facilities are generally used for longer distance or regional travel, and so will be scored at the corridor level, while pedestrian projects have more local relevance and will be score at the individual project level. However, it is possible to bundle both bicycle and pedestrian projects together to form larger “Complete Streets” improvement packages.

Prioritization Process:

The project prioritization process includes the following steps:

- Identification of categories:

Development of the prioritization categories in coordination with the project team along with a breakdown of the meaning and relevance of each category to confirm purpose and understanding of the purpose and scope of the process. The categories used in the process follow the identified goals for the project.

- Weighting of Criteria:

The criteria will be weighted to determine their overall contribution to the project score.

- Initial Project Scoring and Calibration:

Based on the selected weighting factors and local scoring criterion, the prioritization analysis will be performed to establish a preliminary ranking of projects for review by the project team. To facilitate the team's review, the summary may include development of charts, maps, tables and/or infographics.

Prioritization Categories:

Prioritization categories address a range of local needs and allow differences between projects to be identified. To ensure that the prioritization process follows the identified goals of the project, each of the proposed categories are associated with a goal as follows:

- Safety and Comfort – This project is located on a facility with an observed high crash frequency and has potential to improve safety. Safety factors will include whether or not a project is located on a High Injury Corridor and if any recent crashes have occurred related to that specific location or segment. Comfort factors depend on if this project improved the ranking of the facility with regards to the Bicycle or Pedestrian Level of Traffic Stress analysis and the Caltrans Bikeway Selection Guide.
- Connectivity and Access – This project improves accessibility to key destinations via the bicycle or pedestrian network and connects to networks in incorporated cities or regional trails.
- Equity – This project is located within an Environmental Justice Community.
- Implementation – While many factors affecting implementation cannot be quantified easily before prioritization, community support represents a critical element of project feasibility. Projects that are community-identified challenge areas or recommendations will be prioritized.

While this list is expected to include most prioritization categories, additional categories can be identified if desired. Also, specific categories of projects can be pulled out to be

ranked or identified separately, such as bicycle versus pedestrian projects, or regional trails.

Prioritization Scoring Criteria:

The County assigned scores to each category, and then created a combined score by weighting the score for each category by the relevant local weighting factor. Each prioritization category has been given a recommended scoring criterion based on various factors related to each category. The prioritization scoring for bicycle and pedestrian projects are provided in Table C-1.

Table C-1: Prioritization Scoring for Bicycle and Pedestrian Projects:

Category will be listed first along with the possible points each can acquire; followed by subcategory, criteria, and the method of scoring for each criteria.

Category 1: Safety and comfort. (10 points.)

Subcategory 1: Crash Frequency.

Criteria:

- Tier 1 – Located on a High Injury Corridor. (5 points.)
- Tier 2 – Recent Pedestrian- or Bicycle-involved Collisions. (5 years.) (3 points.)

Subcategory 2: User Comfort.

Criteria:

- Meets all ages and ability criteria based on Level of Traffic Stress. (5 points.)

- Doesn’t meet all ages and abilities but closes a gap in the existing network. (3 points.)
- Doesn’t meet all ages and abilities and doesn’t close a gap in the existing network. (0 points.)

Category 2: Connectivity and Access. (10 points.)

Subcategory 1: SCHOOL AND TRANSIT (BUS OR RAIL) ACCESSIBILITY.

Criteria:

- Allows low stress access via the roadway and/or trail network. The project is within a half-mile radius of a school and an existing or planned transit line. (5 points.)
- Allows low stress access via the roadway and/or trail network. The project is within a half-mile radius of a school or an existing or planned transit line. (4 points.)
- The project is within a half-mile radius of a school or an existing or planned transit line, not accounting for user stress. (3 points.)
- The project is within a two-mile radius of a school or an existing or planned transit line, not accounting for user stress. (1 point.)
- The project is located more than two miles from a school or transit line. (0 points.)

Subcategory 2: REGIONAL CONNECTIVITY.

Criteria:

- Connection to regional trails or existing/planned facility in an incorporated city and in an area with a high percentage of short trips. (5 points.)
- In area with high percentage of short trips, no regional trail/City connection. (3 points.)
- Regional trail/City connection only. (3 points.)

- Does not connect to regional trail/City and is in an area with a low percentage of short trips. (0 points.)

Category 3: Equity. (5 points.)

Criteria:

- Project is located within an Environmental Justice community. (5 points.)
- Project improves transit connectivity for bus or rail lines that serve Environmental Justice communities. (3 points.)
- Project improves bicycle or pedestrian connectivity to schools that serve over 70% of students eligible for free or reduced-price meals. (3 points.)
- Project does not meet equity criteria. (0 points.)

Category 4: Implementation. (10 points.)

Subcategory 1: FEASIBILITY/COMPLEXITY.

Criteria:

- High Feasibility/Low Complexity. (5 points.)
- Medium Feasibility/Complexity. (3 points.)
- Low Feasibility/High Complexity. (1 point.)

Subcategory 2: COMMUNITY NEED.

Criteria:

- Project was identified during public engagement for the ATP as a problem area or desired improvement. (5 points.)
- Project was not identified during public engagement for ATP development. (0 points.)

Weighting of Prioritization Categories:

An appropriate weight for each prioritization category will be in consultation with the county and other relevant stakeholders. Criteria may be weighted equally or assigned different weights to emphasize the criteria of one category over another. Table C-2 shows the typical weighting criteria.

Table C-2: Criteria Weighting:

Category will be listed first, followed by subcategory if any, and the typical weighting assigned to each.

Safety and Comfort:

- Crash Frequency: 25%.
- User Comfort: 15%.

Connectivity and access:

- School and transit access: 15%.
- Regional connectivity: 15%.

Equity: 10%.

Implementation:

- Feasibility/Complexity: 15%.
- Community Need: 5%.

Total: 100%.

EXAMPLE SCORE:

The highest scoring pedestrian project is the spot improvement at Myrtle Avenue/Watt Avenue (see Table C-3). This project received a final score of 4.40 of five possible points. The project received the following scores in each category/subcategory:

Table C-3: Prioritization Example:

Crash Frequency. (25%.)

Score: 5.

Weighted Score Value: 1.25.

User Comfort. (15%.)

Score: 5.

Weighted Score Value: 0.75.

School and transit access (15%.)

Score: 5.

Weighted Score Value: 0.75.

Regional Connectivity. (15%.)

Score: 3.

Weighted Score Value: 0.45.

Equity. (10%.)

Score: 5.

Weighted Score Value: 0.5.

Feasibility/ Complexity. (15%.)

Score: 3.

Weighted Score Value: 0.45.

Community Need. (5%.)

Score: 5.

Weighted Score Value: 0.25.

Total Weighted Score Value: 4.4.

Moving From Prioritization to Implementation:

A prioritized list of projects provides valuable guidance for County staff moving forward. The list provides direction and an implementation order based on a variety of factors including funding opportunities, local maintenance schedules, community support, and other feasibility considerations. As such, the County will consider these factors when programming, and implementing recommended projects. This will further advance Goal 4: Implementation.

Table C-4 provides the full prioritization breakdown for pedestrian projects.

Table C-5 provides the full prioritization of sidewalk gap projects. Figure C-1 shows recommended pedestrian facilities throughout Sacramento County. Table C-6 provides the prioritization breakdown for recommended bicycle projects. Figure C-2 shows recommended bicycle facilities throughout Sacramento County.

Table C-4: Pedestrian Intersection Recommendations:

Project ID will be listed first; Other column headings will be stated below.

Project ID: 122.

Street 1: Myrtle Avenue.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 150.

Street 1: Elkhorn Blvd.

Street 2: Roseville Road.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Overcrossing.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Cost Estimate: $11,250.

Rank: 2.

Project ID: 22.

Street 1: Walerga Road.

Street 2: Roseville Road.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Overcrossing.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Cost Estimate: $14,250.

Rank: 2.

Project ID: 16.

Street 1: Martin Luther King Jr Blvd.

Street 2: Fruitridge Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 4.

Project ID: 172.

Street 1: Andrea Blvd.

Street 2: Roseville Road.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $41,250.

Rank: 5.

Project ID: 19.

Street 1: 47th Avenue.

Street 2: Martin Luther King Jr Blvd.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 143.

Street 1: Arden Way.

Street 2: Bell Street.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 147.

Street 1: Arden Way.

Street 2: Driveway To Howe bout arden Shopping Center.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $7,750.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 154.

Street 1: Arden Way.

Street 2: Ethan Way.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $7,750.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 110.

Street 1: Bell Street.

Street 2: El Camino Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 159.

Street 1: Edison Avenue.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 26.

Street 1: Florin Road.

Street 2: Briggs Drive.

Street 3: Palmer House Drive.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 148.

Street 1: Fruitridge Road.

Street 2: 44th Street.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 53.
Street 1: Fulton Avenue.
Street 2: Hurley Way.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: D5.
Priority: No.
Score: 3.95.
Cost Estimate: $51,150.
Rank: 6.

Project ID: 98.
Street 1: Howe Avenue.
Street 2: Cottage Way.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: D5.
Priority: No.
Score: 3.95.
Cost Estimate: $51,150.
Rank: 6.

Project ID: 158.
Street 1: Madison Avenue.
Street 2: Jackson Street.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 18.

Street 1: Whitney Avenue.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 6.

Project ID: 105.

Street 1: Florin Road.

Street 2: Franklin Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Cost Estimate: $97,650.

Rank: 18.

Project ID: 133.

Street 1: Roseville Road.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Cost Estimate: $97,650.

Rank: 18.

Project ID: 71.

Street 1: Walerga Road.

Street 2: Elkhorn Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 18.

Project ID: 177.

Street 1: Arden Way.

Street 2: Morse Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 21.

Project ID: 81.
Street 1: Fulton Avenue.
Street 2: Pope Avenue.
Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.
Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Priority: Yes.
Score: 3.8.
Cost Estimate: $38,750.
Rank: 21.

Project ID: 112.
Street 1: Fulton Avenue.
Street 2: Edison Avenue.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Priority: Yes.
Score: 3.8.
Cost Estimate: $51,150.
Rank: 21.

Project ID: 7.
Street 1: Howe Avenue.
Street 2: Sierra Blvd.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 21.

Project ID: 108.

Street 1: Northrop Avenue.

Street 2: Fulton Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 21.

Project ID: 34.

Street 1: Power Inn Road.

Street 2: Elsie Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 21.

Project ID: 123.

Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Street 2: Pope Avenue.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 21.

Project ID: 169.

Street 1: Winding Creek Road.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Street 3: Cottage Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 21.

Project ID: 89.

Street 1: Coyle Avenue.

Street 2: Dewey Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 153.

Street 1: Dewey Drive.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 149.

Street 1: Eastern Avenue.

Street 2: Marconi Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 135.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Engle Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 40.

Street 1: Manzanita Avenue.

Street 2: Cypress Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 128.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Mission Avenue.

Street 3: Wrendale Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 152.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Norris Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 115.

Street 1: Oak Avenue.

Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 8.

Street 1: Robertson Avenue.

Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 29.

Project ID: 102.

Street 1: Airbase Drive.

Street 2: Roseville Road.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Overcrossing.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $14,250.

Rank: 28.

Project ID: 174.

Street 1: Bell Street.

Street 2: Marconi Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 39.

Project ID: 187.

Street 1: Fulton Avenue.

Street 2: Cottage Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 39.

Project ID: 48.

Street 1: Howe Avenue.

Street 2: Hurley Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 39.

Project ID: 44.

Street 1: Madison Avenue.

Street 2: Hemlock Street.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 39.

Project ID: 4.

Street 1: Walnut Avenue.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 39.

Project ID: 117.

Street 1: Wright Street.

Street 2: Arden Way.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 39.

Project ID: 151.

Street 1: Wright Street.

Street 2: Marconi Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 39.

Project ID: 163.

Street 1: Stevenson Avenue.

Street 2: Spengler Drive.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $39,835.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 68.

Street 1: Alta Arden Expressway.

Street 2: Howe Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 79.

Street 1: Alta Arden Expressway.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 67.

Street 1: Arden Way.

Street 2: Fulton Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 87.

Street 1: Arden Way.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 23.

Street 1: El Camino Avenue.

Street 2: Morse Avenue.

Street 3: Drayton Drive.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $705,250.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 134.

Street 1: El Camino Avenue.

Street 2: Howe Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 58.

Street 1: Franklin Blvd.

Street 2: 47Th Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 129.

Street 1: Howe Avenue.

Street 2: Arden Way.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 161.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Fulton Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 43.

Street 1: Stockton Blvd.

Street 2: Florin Road.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $128,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 131.

Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Street 2: Roseville Road.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $190,650.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 93.

Street 1: Wright Street.

Street 2: El Camino Avenue.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $271,250.

Rank: 46.

Project ID: 183.
Street 1: Manzanita Avenue.
Street 2: Auburn Blvd.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Priority: No.
Score: 3.6.
Cost Estimate: $60,450.
Rank: 59.

Project ID: 52.
Street 1: Palm Avenue.
Street 2: Coyle Avenue.
Street 3: Manzanita Avenue.
Intersection Type: Small Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Priority: No.
Score: 3.6.
Cost Estimate: $38,750.
Rank: 59.

Project ID: 166.
Street 1: Butano Drive.
Street 2: Watt Avenue.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 61.

Project ID: 84.

Street 1: College Oak Drive.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 61.

Project ID: 14.

Street 1: Howe Avenue.

Street 2: Northrop Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 61.

Project ID: 100.

Street 1: Roseville Road.

Street 2: Palm Avenue.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $7,750.

Rank: 61.

Project ID: 10.

Street 1: Florin Road.

Street 2: 65Th Street.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 85.

Street 1: Gerber Road.

Street 2: Power Inn Road.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 137.

Street 1: Hackberry Lane.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 42.

Street 1: Hazel Avenue.

Street 2: Pershing Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 162.

Street 1: Manzanita Avenue.

Street 2: Winding Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 181.

Street 1: Manzanita Avenue.

Street 2: Lincoln Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 73.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 90.
Street 1: Schuyler Drive.
Street 2: Madison Avenue.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: C6.
Priority: No.
Score: 3.5.
Cost Estimate: $51,150.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 88.
Street 1: Stockton Blvd.
Street 2: Gerber Road.
Intersection Type: Major Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: G4.
Priority: Yes.
Score: 3.5.
Cost Estimate: $97,650.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 28.
Street 1: Greenback Lane.
Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Intersection Type: Major Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: B7.
Priority: No.
Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $190,650.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 56.

Street 1: Auberry Drive.

Street 2: Triad Circle.

Street 3: Meadowhaven Drive.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $7,750.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 80.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Winding Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 36.

Street 1: Wilbur Way.

Street 2: Gerber Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 82.

Street 1: Dewey Drive.

Street 2: Saint James Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 130.

Street 1: Dewey Drive.

Street 2: Palm Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 27.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: El Camino Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $97,650.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 180.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 3: Palm Drive.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 156.

Street 1: Rutland Drive.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 75.

Project ID: 178.

Street 1: 65Th Street.

Street 2: Stockton Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 101.

Street 1: Airbase Drive.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $128,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 140.

Street 1: Alta Arden Expressway.

Street 2: Ethan Way.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D4 .

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 60.

Street 1: Auburn Blvd.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $128,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 83.

Street 1: Auburn Blvd.

Street 2: Business 80 North bound Marconi Avenue Off.

Street 3: Marconi Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $128,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 107.

Street 1: El Camino Avenue.

Street 2: Fulton Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 62.

Street 1: Hillsdale Blvd.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $97,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 6.

Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Street 2: Airbase Drive.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 114.

Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Street 2: Don Julio Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.4.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 83.

Project ID: 136.

Street 1: Madison Avenue.

Street 2: Manzanita Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 92.

Project ID: 24.

Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.3.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 93.

Project ID: 25.

Street 1: El Camino Avenue.

Street 2: Watt Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 32.

Street 1: Fulton Avenue.

Street 2: Alta Arden Expressway.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 59.

Street 1: Garfield Avenue.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $128,650.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 142.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Montclaire Street.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 66.

Street 1: Mission Avenue.

Street 2: Whitney Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 141.

Street 1: Morse Avenue.

Street 2: Sierra Blvd.

Street 3: Northrop Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 109.

Street 1: Norris Avenue.

Street 2: Edison Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 164.

Street 1: Power Inn Road.

Street 2: Florin Road.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 9.

Street 1: Watt Avenue.

Street 2: Elkhorn Blvd.

Street 3: Elkhorn Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 39.

Street 1: Whitney Avenue.

Street 2: Eastern Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 94.

Project ID: 29.

Street 1: Auburn Blvd.

Street 2: Orange Grove Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 61.

Street 1: Filbert Avenue.

Street 2: Greenback Lane.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 11.

Street 1: Greenback Lane.

Street 2: Illinois Avenue.

Street 3: Hickory Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 47.

Street 1: Greenback Lane.

Street 2: Trajan Drive.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 176.

Street 1: Hemlock Street.

Street 2: Auburn Blvd.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 170.

Street 1: Larchmont Drive.

Street 2: Walerga Road.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $7,750.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 55.

Street 1: Main Avenue.

Street 2: Greenback Lane.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 97.

Street 1: Sunrise Blvd.

Street 2: Winding Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 51.

Street 1: Dewey Drive.

Street 2: Palm Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 37.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: North Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled on FOB; Ped signal on North Avenue.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 41.

Street 1: Manzanita Avenue.

Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $97,650.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 78.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Walnut Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $190,650.

Rank: 104.

Project ID: 179.

Street 1: 47Th Avenue.

Street 2: 44Th Street.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 116.

Project ID: 92.

Street 1: Rosemont Drive.

Street 2: Goethe Road.

Street 3: Mayhew Road.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 117.

Project ID: 31.

Street 1: Central Avenue.

Street 2: Hazel Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 118.

Project ID: 46.

Street 1: Greenback Lane.

Street 2: Kenneth Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 118.

Project ID: 146.

Street 1: Sunset Avenue.

Street 2: Sunrise Blvd.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 118.

Project ID: 77.

Street 1: Elkhorn Blvd.

Street 2: Dry Creek Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 121.

Project ID: 182.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: California Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 121.

Project ID: 145.

Street 1: Lincoln Avenue.

Street 2: Barrett Road.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 121.

Project ID: 33.

Street 1: Palmerson Drive.

Street 2: North Loop Blvd.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 121.

Project ID: 96.

Street 1: Sunrise Blvd.

Street 2: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $128,650.

Rank: 121.

Project ID: 70.

Street 1: West Elkhorn Blvd.

Street 2: Marysville Blvd.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority: No.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 121.

Project ID: 3.

Street 1: Marconi Avenue.

Street 2: Morse Avenue.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 127.

Project ID: 35.

Street 1: Coyle Avenue.

Street 2: Parkoaks Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 127.

Project ID: 139.

Street 1: Bainbridge Drive.

Street 2: Larchmont Drive.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $39,835.

Rank: 129.

Project ID: 74.

Street 1: Elkhorn Blvd.

Street 2: Larchmont Drive.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 129.

Project ID: 104.

Street 1: Hillsdale Blvd.

Street 2: Diablo Drive.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $47,275.

Rank: 129.

Project ID: 116.

Street 1: Stevenson Avenue.

Street 2: Power Inn Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 129.

Project ID: 119.

Street 1: Andrea Blvd.

Street 2: Diablo Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 133.

Project ID: 65.

Street 1: Elverta Road.

Street 2: Palmerson Drive.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 133.

Project ID: 72.

Street 1: Florin Road.

Street 2: Florin Perkins Road.

Street 3: French Road.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.8.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 135.

Project ID: 168.

Street 1: Hazel Avenue.

Street 2: Greenback Lane.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 2.75.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 136.

Project ID: 120.

Street 1: Madison Avenue.

Street 2: Hazel Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 2.75.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 136.

Project ID: 173.
Street 1: Monument Drive.
Street 2: Galbrath Drive.
Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Priority: No.
Score: 2.75.
Cost Estimate: $39,835.
Rank: 136.

Project ID: 20.
Street 1: Bell Street.
Street 2: Edison Avenue.
Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Priority: No.
Score: 2.7.
Cost Estimate: $48,360.
Rank: 139.

Project ID: 127.
Street 1: Calvine Road.
Street 2: Vintage Park Drive.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 91.

Street 1: Hurley Way.

Street 2: Bell Street.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 21.

Street 1: Morse Avenue.

Street 2: Hurley Way.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 144.

Street 1: Oak Avenue.

Street 2: Hickory Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 13.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Kenneth Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 76.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Beginning of FOB Right Turn Slip Lane (Near Don Way).

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 124.
Street 1: Marconi Avenue.
Street 2: Morse Avenue.
Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.
Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.
Map Book Grid ID: D5.
Priority: Yes.
Score: 2.65.
Cost Estimate: $252,650.
Rank: 146.

Project ID: 188.
Street 1: Elkhorn Blvd.
Street 2: I-80.
Intersection Type: Interstate Ramp.
Traffic Control: Interstate Ramp with slip lanes.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Priority: No.
Score: 2.6.
Cost Estimate: $38,750.
Rank: 147.

Project ID: 138.
Street 1: Larchmont Drive.
Street 2: Galbrath Drive.
Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.
Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 147.

Project ID: 171.

Street 1: Palmerson Drive.

Street 2: Heartland Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.55.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 149.

Project ID: 113.

Street 1: Vintage Park Drive.

Street 2: Brittany Park Drive.

Street 3: Delahye Circle.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.55.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 149.

Project ID: 49.

Street 1: Edison Avenue.

Street 2: Eastern Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 2.

Street 1: Engle Road.

Street 2: Mission Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 45.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Central Avenue.

Street 3: Winding Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 103.

Street 1: Jan Drive.

Street 2: Winding Way.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 125.

Street 1: Moraga Drive.

Street 2: Jan Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 111.

Street 1: Whitney Avenue.

Street 2: Norris Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 194.

Street 1: Winding Way.

Street 2: Dewey Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 54.

Street 1: Cottage Way.

Street 2: Morse Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 158.

Project ID: 192.

Street 1: Elk Grove Florin Road.

Street 2: Elder Creek Trail.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 158.

Project ID: 191.

Street 1: Gerber Road.

Street 2: Passalis Lane.

Intersection Type: Medium intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $252,650.

Rank: 158.

Project ID: 160.

Street 1: Orange Grove Avenue.

Street 2: Pasadena Avenue.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $7,750.

Rank: 158.

Project ID: 5.

Street 1: Tiogawoods Drive.

Street 2: French Road.

Street 3: Gerber Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 158.

Project ID: 12.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: Kenneth Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: Yes.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 158.

Project ID: 75.

Street 1: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Street 2: End Of F O B Right Turn Slip Lane. (Near Wayside Lane.)

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 158.

Project ID: 17.

Street 1: 65Th Street.

Street 2: 53rd Avenue.

Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.

Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $248,775.

Rank: 165.

Project ID: 64.

Street 1: Elverta Road.

Street 2: Rio Linda Blvd.

Street 3: West Elverta Road.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 165.

Project ID: 190.

Street 1: Florin Road.

Street 2: SR-99.

Intersection Type: Interstate Ramp.

Traffic Control: Interstate Ramp with slip lanes.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 165.

Project ID: 69.

Street 1: Greenback Lane.

Street 2: Madison Avenue.

Street 3: Lake Natoma Drive.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $97,650.

Rank: 165.

Project ID: 118.

Street 1: Mission Avenue.

Street 2: Cottage Way.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 169.

Project ID: 63.

Street 1: Gunn Road.

Street 2: Kenneth Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 170.

Project ID: 126.

Street 1: Kenneth Avenue.

Street 2: Garfield Avenue.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 170.

Project ID: 99.

Street 1: Kiefer Blvd.

Street 2: Huntsman Drive.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 170.

Project ID: 185.

Street 1: Poker Lane.

Street 2: Don Julio Blvd.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $60,450.

Rank: 170.

Project ID: 94.

Street 1: Q Street.

Street 2: Dry Creek Road.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 170.

Project ID: 193.

Street 1: San Juan Avenue.

Street 2: Winding Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 170.

Project ID: 132.

Street 1: San Juan Avenue.

Street 2: Winding Way.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 170.

Project ID: 106.

Street 1: Dewey Drive.

Street 2: Papaya Drive.

Street 3: Moraga Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.2.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 177.

Project ID: 95.

Street 1: Eastern Avenue.

Street 2: El Camino Avenue.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.2.

Cost Estimate: $66,650.

Rank: 177.

Project ID: 86.

Street 1: Millburn Street.

Street 2: Coyle Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.2.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 177.

Project ID: 165.
Street 1: Don Julio Blvd.
Street 2: Walerga Road.
Intersection Type: Major Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Priority: Yes.
Score: 2.15.
Cost Estimate: $66,650.
Rank: 180.

Project ID: 155.
Street 1: Monument Drive.
Street 2: Antelope Road.
Intersection Type: Priority Ped Intersection.
Traffic Control: Minor Street Stop Controlled.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Priority: No.
Score: 2.15.
Cost Estimate: $271,250.
Rank: 180.

Project ID: 30.
Street 1: Central Avenue.
Street 2: Trajan Drive.
Intersection Type: Small Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 182.

Project ID: 1.

Street 1: Dillard Road.

Street 2: Colony Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: H7.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 182.

Project ID: 167.

Street 1: Franklin Blvd.

Street 2: Hood Franklin Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: I4.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 182.

Project ID: 184.

Street 1: Walnut Grove Bridge.

Street 2: River Road.

Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: L3.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $51,150.

Rank: 182.

Project ID: 15.

Street 1: Sunset Avenue.

Street 2: Kenneth Avenue.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority: No.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 186.

Project ID: 189.

Street 1: Hazel Avenue.

Street 2: US 50.

Intersection Type: Interstate Ramp.

Traffic Control: Interstate Ramp with slip lanes.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority: No.

Score: 1.95.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 187.

Project ID: 50.
Street 1: Marconi Avenue.
Street 2: Gunn Road.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.
Map Book Grid ID: D6.
Priority: No.
Score: 1.95.
Cost Estimate: $283,650.
Rank: 187.

Project ID: 57.
Street 1: Pershing Avenue.
Street 2: Illinois Avenue.
Intersection Type: Small Intersection.
Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.
Map Book Grid ID: B8.
Priority: No.
Score: 1.95.
Cost Estimate: $38,750.
Rank: 187.

Project ID: 121.
Street 1: West Elkhorn Blvd.
Street 2: West 2Nd Street.
Intersection Type: Medium Intersection.
Traffic Control: Uncontrolled Intersection.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority: No.

Score: 1.95.

Cost Estimate: $283,650.

Rank: 187.

Project ID: 157.

Street 1: I Street.

Street 2: 20Th Street.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority: No.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 191.

Project ID: 38.

Street 1: Poker Flat Drive.

Street 2: Coloma Road.

Street 3: Gold Country Blvd.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Traffic Signal.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority: No.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 191.

Project ID: 175.

Street 1: Saverien Drive.

Street 2: American River Drive.

Intersection Type: Small Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority: No.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $38,750.

Rank: 191.

Project ID: 186.

Street 1: Franklin Blvd.

Street 2: Bilby Road.

Intersection Type: Major Intersection.

Traffic Control: All-Way Stop.

Map Book Grid ID: I4.

Priority: No.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $82,150.

Rank: 194.

Table C-5: Sidewalk Gap Projects:

Street Name and Gap Number will be listed first; Other column headings will be stated below.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 895.47.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $125,365.

Rank: 1.

Street Name and Gap Number: 47th Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1340.03.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $375,205.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: Anna Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 683.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $191,310.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 683.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $191,310.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: Orange Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2026.82.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $567,510.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,943.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 332.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $93,140.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 266.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,255.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 614.97.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $86,095.

Rank: 2.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fruitridge Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 293.69.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $41,118.

Rank: 10.

Street Name and Gap Number: East Stockton Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 223.87.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,685.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: East Stockton Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 447.74.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,683.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: East Stockton Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 932.11.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $130,495.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: East Stockton Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 599.21.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $83,890.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jackson Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 156.97.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $21,975.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 937.73.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $131,283.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1425.52.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $399,145.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 24.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1235.45.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $172,963.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 25.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1164.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $162,985.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 559.67.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $156,710.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 671.60.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $188,050.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1226.42.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $171,700.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 797.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $223,300.

Rank: 11.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 717.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $100,383.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1425.52.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $199,573.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 570.21.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $79,830.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 26.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 766.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $214,510.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1179.70.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $165,158.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 532.63.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,568.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 532.63.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,568.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 531.20.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $148,735.

Rank: 24.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 414.61.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $58,045.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 580.39.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $81,255.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1110.71.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $155,500.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 979.72.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $274,320.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2345.06.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $656,615.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2345.06.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $656,615.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.29.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,000.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dawn Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 317.20.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,408.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dewey Drive – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 864.04.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $241,930.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 381.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $53,363.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 356.26.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,878.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 157.67.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,075.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 581.60.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $81,423.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 449.42.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $125,835.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,208.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue Bell Street Tamarack Way Alley – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 213.19.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,845.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Howe Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.33.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,008.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 262.80.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,793.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 893.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $250,185.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 893.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $250,185.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 237.68.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,275.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1029.94.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $288,380.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1213.50.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $169,890.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Montclaire Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 474.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,375.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4493.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,258,215.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Northrop Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 581.71.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $81,440.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sierra Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2784.90.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $779,775.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 157.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,010.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 157.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,010.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.
Length: (In feet.) 253.41.
Map Book Grid ID: D5.
Priority Network: Yes.
Score: 4.25.
Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,478.
Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 8.
Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.
Length: (In feet.) 558.10.
Map Book Grid ID: D5.
Priority Network: Yes.
Score: 4.25.
Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $78,135.
Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 1.
Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.
Length: (In feet.) 2215.66.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Priority Network: Yes.
Score: 4.25.
Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $620,385.
Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 2.
Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.
Length: (In feet.) 263.77.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,928.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 157.99.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,118.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1678.67.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $470,030.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 209.83.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,378.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 436.67.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $61,135.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 359.56.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $100,675.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1815.73.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $508,405.

Rank: 32.

Street Name and Gap Number: Driveway East Of Watt Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 86.46.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,210.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Florin Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.67.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,635.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fruitridge Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 284.65.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $39,850.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fruitridge Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 325.82.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $45,615.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fulton Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1239.03.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $173,463.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: I-80 East Bound – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1052.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $294,605.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2987.20.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $836,415.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2241.36.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $627,580.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mendocino Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 121.24.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,945.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Montclaire Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 395.09.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $110,625.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1003.79.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $281,060.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 172.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,245.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 128.27.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,915.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 183.28.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,320.

Rank: 71.

Street Name and Gap Number: Arden Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4007.39.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,122,070.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dewey Drive – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 545.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $76,355.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dewey Drive – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 244.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,175.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dewey Drive – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 229.97.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $32,195.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dixon Oaks Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 953.14.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,440.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 395.63.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $55,388.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2268.44.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $635,160.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2207.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $618,030.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 210.79.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,510.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 80.91.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,655.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 178.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,940.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 190.02.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $26,603.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 238.21.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,350.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 291.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,760.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gobernadores Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3131.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $876,755.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 317.71.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,960.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,933.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 319.22.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,690.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Landis Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1968.24.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $551,110.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Locust Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 191.75.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $53,690.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1266.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $177,275.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1029.95.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $144,193.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 211.23.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,145.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 422.46.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,145.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 475.27.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,538.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.42.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,360.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 4 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 712.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $199,570.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 5 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 316.78.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,350.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 6 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 763.69.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $106,918.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Norris Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 316.73.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,343.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 293.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $41,083.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 251.53.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,215.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wrendale Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.37.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,173.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 660.39.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $92,455.

Rank: 85.

Street Name and Gap Number: Airbase Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 352.69.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $98,750.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Airbase Drive – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 795.49.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $222,735.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 163.44.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,883.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.48.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,608.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 410.68.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $57,495.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 176.01.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,280.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 645.94.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $90,433.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 462.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,765.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 237.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,310.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 237.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,310.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Folsom Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 2273.00.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $318,220.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 160.18.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,425.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hemlock Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 664.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $93,003.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hillsdale Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 165.72.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,200.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mayhew Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1450.10.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $203,015.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pamela Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 422.96.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $118,430.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1610.71.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $225,500.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 656.97.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $183,950.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 167.42.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $46,880.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1171.97.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $164,075.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1509.42.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $422,635.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sierra Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 238.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,350.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 273.98.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,358.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 214.41.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,018.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 586.41.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $82,098.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1919.16.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $537,365.

Rank: 119.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 577.61.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $80,865.

Rank: 145.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 507.91.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $71,108.

Rank: 146.

Street Name and Gap Number: Manzanita Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.60.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,945.

Rank: 146.

Street Name and Gap Number: Manzanita Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 159.68.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,355.

Rank: 146.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 157.36.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,030.

Rank: 146.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 30.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 605.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $84,700.

Rank: 146.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 249.88.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $69,965.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 187.41.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $26,238.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Chippendale Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,275.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 242.67.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,973.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 529.53.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $148,270.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,208.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 277.59.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,863.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 633.88.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,743.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1266.80.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $354,705.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,170.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 179.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $50,190.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1702.92.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $238,408.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1523.66.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $426,625.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 223.87.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,685.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 163.81.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $45,870.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 224.70.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $31,458.

Rank: 151.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1604.75.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $449,330.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 244.39.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,215.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.70.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,958.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 449.32.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $125,810.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.70.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,958.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1059.04.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $296,530.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 317.71.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,960.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 211.81.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,305.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 423.62.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,308.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 328.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $91,995.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Manzanita Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 249.71.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,960.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Manzanita Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 499.42.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $69,918.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Manzanita Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 187.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $26,220.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Manzanita Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1176.80.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $164,753.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Manzanita Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 252.17.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,305.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.28.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,160.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marconi Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.04.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,545.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 381.86.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $53,460.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1234.83.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $345,750.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 331.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $92,800.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 660.03.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $184,810.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 580.83.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $81,315.

Rank: 167.

Street Name and Gap Number: 48th Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 635.27.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $177,875.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.32.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,585.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 351.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $98,515.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2638.52.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $738,785.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2008.06.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $562,260.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 369.63.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,748.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,963.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Greenback Lane – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 633.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,645.

Rank: 189.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0

Length: (In feet.) 264.02

Map Book Grid ID: D5

Priority Network: No

Score: 3.75

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,925

Rank: 189

Street Name and Gap Number: Auburn Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 230.41.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $32,258.

Rank: 198.

Street Name and Gap Number: Florin Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 423.34.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $118,535.

Rank: 198.

Street Name and Gap Number: Antelope Road – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 753.60.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $105,505.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Antelope Road – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 738.15.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,343.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Florin Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 10662.25.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $2,985,430.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 623.35.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $87,270.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 389.59.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $109,085.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Northrop Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 262.35.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,730.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 30.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 845.99.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $118,438.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 316.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,378.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunrise Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 404.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $56,575.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunrise Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 190.79.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $26,710.

Rank: 200.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1029.48.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $288,255.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 211.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,115.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 171.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,040.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 686.19.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $192,135.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Folsom Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1997.27.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $279,618.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1319.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $369,405.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 534.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $149,740.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marysville Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 499.76.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $139,930.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marysville Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 775.90.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $217,255.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 2 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 475.17.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,525.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue - 14 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2587.63.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $724,535.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 762.29.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $213,440.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 457.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,033.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: West Elkhorn Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 5190.28.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,453,280.

Rank: 210.

Street Name and Gap Number: West Elkhorn Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 437.95.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $122,625.

Rank: 210

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 168.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,655.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 450.55.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $126,155.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 337.91.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $94,615.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 25.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 317.71.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,960.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 27.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 529.52.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,133.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 30.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 953.14.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $266,880.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hickory Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 478.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $67,055.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 328.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $45,998.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Larchmont Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 447.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,650.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 710.47.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $99,465.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 369.58.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,740.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 633.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,698.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunrise Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 356.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,888.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 482.91.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $67,608.

Rank: 225.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.50.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,610.

Rank: 239.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 738.63.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.45.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,408.

Rank: 239.

Street Name and Gap Number: Arden Way – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 660.64.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $92,490.

Rank: 241.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2296.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $643,015.

Rank: 241.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1392.04.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $389,770.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 634.28.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $177,600.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.57.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,200.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 792.85.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $111,000.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 317.14.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,800.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 24.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 389.59.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $54,543.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 26.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 233.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $32,725.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 332.70.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $93,155.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.62.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,948.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Oak Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.62.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,948.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunrise Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 415.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $58,203.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunrise Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 277.09.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,793.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 184.95.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,785.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 323.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $45,313.

Rank: 243.

Street Name and Gap Number: Barrett Road – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 576.29.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $161,360.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 27.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 431.69.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $120,870.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 658.10.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $184,270.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 239.32.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $67,010.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 871.80.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $122,053.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 210.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,075.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 259.76.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,368.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 185.00.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,800.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 370.66.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,893.

Rank: 257.

Street Name and Gap Number: Andrea Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 689.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $96,473.

Rank: 266.

Street Name and Gap Number: Antelope Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 219.07.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,670.

Rank: 266.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1065.45.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $149,163.

Rank: 266.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hillsdale Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 714.48.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $100,028.

Rank: 266.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jackson Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 209.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,303.

Rank: 266.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jackson Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 366.27.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $102,555.

Rank: 266.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1460.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $204,403.

Rank: 266.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elk Grove Florin Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4664.55.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,306,075.

Rank: 273.

Street Name and Gap Number: Excelsior Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 5301.95.

Map Book Grid ID: F7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,484,545.

Rank: 273.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 476.19.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,668.

Rank: 273.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3220.76.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $901,815.

Rank: 273.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 353.58.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $99,005.

Rank: 273.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dewey Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 346.55.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $97,035.

Rank: 278.

Street Name and Gap Number: Franklin Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 313.85.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $43,940.

Rank: 278.

Street Name and Gap Number: Greenback Lane – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 671.64.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $94,030.

Rank: 278.

Street Name and Gap Number: Isleton Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 41982.89.

Map Book Grid ID: M2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $11,755,210.

Rank: 278.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 203.98.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,558.

Rank: 278.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 203.98.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,558.

Rank: 278.

Street Name and Gap Number: Vintage Park Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2116.95.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $592,745.

Rank: 278.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jackson Street – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 261.62.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.05.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,628.

Rank: 285.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 580.47.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $81,265.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1216.49.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $340,615.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.56.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,620.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 193.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $54,160.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 391.89.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $54,865.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 634.44.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,820.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1163.13.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $325,675.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1163.13.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $325,675.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1532.89.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $214,605.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 102.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,705.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Calvine Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 168.74.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,625.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: College Oak Drive – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 791.09.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $110,753.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: College Oak Drive – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 732.10.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $204,990.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 237.89.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,305.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.31.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,003.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1320.46.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $369,730.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 437.87.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $61,303.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 412.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $115,400.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 412.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $115,400.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 176.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,730.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 176.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,460.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 445.33.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,348.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 200.45.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,063.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Glenwood Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1527.00.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $427,560.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.72.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,220.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.53.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,035.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 211.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,255.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 423.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,255.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,628.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.72.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,220.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 579.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $162,180.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hurley Way – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 210.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,488.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Martin Luther King Jr Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 174.36.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,410.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Martin Luther King Jr Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 606.82.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $169,910.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Montclaire Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2528.59.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $708,005.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 952.63.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $266,735.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 581.25.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $81,375.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 528.41.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $147,955.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.52.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,385.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.36.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,590.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Munroe Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 243.91.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,148.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Norris Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 877.32.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $245,650.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Northrop Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.41.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,018.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Northrop Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1692.25.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $473,830.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 329.08.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $46,073.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 290.55.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,678.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Persimmon Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 768.58.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $215,200.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2637.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $738,365.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Unnamed Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1378.07.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $192,930.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 353.58.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,503.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 316.98.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,378.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1003.78.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $140,528.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wesley Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 639.20.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $178,975.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wesley Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1207.51.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $338,100.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 289.65.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,550.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 475.79.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,220.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 504.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $70,618.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 756.62.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $211,850.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 457.36.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,030.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 274.42.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $76,835.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0

Length: (In feet.) 1539.38

Map Book Grid ID: C6

Priority Network: No

Score: 3

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $431,025

Rank: 286

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1394.48.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $390,455.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 314.75.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,065.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 370.25.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,835.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 370.25.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,835.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 751.04.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $105,145.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 153.89.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $21,545.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 310.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $43,530.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 290.76.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,705.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,963.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 290.89.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,725.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cottage Way – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 474.67.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,455.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 374.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $104,760.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 153.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $42,980.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.37.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 3.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,593.

Rank: 286.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bradshaw Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 50.72.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $14,200.

Rank: 361.

Street Name and Gap Number: Santa Juanita – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 5176.59.

Map Book Grid ID: A8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,449,445.

Rank: 361.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2639.33.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $739,015.

Rank: 363.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 365.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,153.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 235.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $65,895.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 882.55.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No .

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $123,558.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 176.01.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,640.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 352.02.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $98,565.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elder Creek Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 603.89.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $84,545.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 601.81.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $84,253.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fulton Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 219.13.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,678.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 842.71.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $235,960.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 200.45.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $56,125.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 34.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 801.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $112,250.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Greenback Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 820.90.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $114,925.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1198.72.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $167,823.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 198.56.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,800.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 365.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $102,240.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Munroe Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 601.89.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $84,265.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Myrtle Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 163.59.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,903.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Myrtle Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 232.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $32,598.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Northrop Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 262.35.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,730.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 475.48.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,135.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 369.82.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,775.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1002.88.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $280,805.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sierra Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 476.42.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,698.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sierra Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 317.61.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,465.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Spruce Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 400.89.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $56,125.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 245.33.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,345.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stockton Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 245.33.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,345.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Virgusell Circle – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1520.78.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $425,820.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 420.39.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $58,855.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 600.55.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $84,078.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Ethan Way – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 240.22.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,630.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wright Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 269.31.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.85.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $75,405.

Rank: 364.

Street Name and Gap Number: Arden Way – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.79.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,650.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Arden Way – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.84.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,238.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Arden Way – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.79.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,650.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Arden Way – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 305.46.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $42,765.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Barberry Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4266.57.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,194,640.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Becerra Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1343.10.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $376,065.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Buena Vista Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1721.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $482,005.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Buena Vista Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1777.87.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $497,805.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 207.64.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,070.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 622.92.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $174,415.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1715.80.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $480,425.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 343.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $96,085.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 171.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,020.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 343.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,043.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 171.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,040.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 514.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $72,063.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 343.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,043.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 343.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,043.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 514.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $144,125.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 171.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,020.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 343.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,043.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 343.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $96,085.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 184.73.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,863.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cardinal Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2799.72.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $783,920.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cassady Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 857.90.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $240,210.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 369.57.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,740.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 739.14.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,480.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 212.96.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,815.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Dewey Drive – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 811.90.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $113,665.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 216.94.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,373.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 237.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,233.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.25.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,155.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1016.96.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $142,373.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 374.67.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $104,905.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1319.17.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $369,370.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2057.39.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $576,070.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 162.43.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,740.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1782.75.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $499,170.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 356.26.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,878.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 178.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,875.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 25.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 267.20.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,408.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 26.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 178.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,875.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 27.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 166.08.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,253.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 28.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1026.86.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $143,760.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 29.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 707.03.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $98,985.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 30.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 212.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,695.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 527.87.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,903.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.12.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,270.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.53.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,893.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Centro Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4063.14.

Map Book Grid ID: C2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,137,680.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1374.46.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $384,850.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 687.23.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $96,213.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 28.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 351.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,193.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Falcon Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1159.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $162,363.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Glademont Court – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 171.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,040.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Goethe Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 620.56.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $86,878.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Grant Line Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1866.79.

Map Book Grid ID: I6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $261,350.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hackberry Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 128.23.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,905.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hackberry Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1244.77.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $348,535.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hackberry Lane – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 296.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $82,920.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 394.27.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $110,395.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,933.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 319.22.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $89,380.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 359.12.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $50,278.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 438.92.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $122,900.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 305.60.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $42,783.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kiefer Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1493.42.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $418,160.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kiefer Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 537.82.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $75,295.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kiefer Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 430.25.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $60,235.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Village Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 70.29.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $19,680.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Locust Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1991.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $557,755.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Locust Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 306.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $85,810.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Madison Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 512.42.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $71,738.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Madison Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 512.42.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $71,738.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Madison Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 512.42.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $71,738.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 275.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $77,040.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mauer Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 343.16.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,043.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Merry Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 171.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,040.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 1 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.53.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,390.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 3 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 791.95.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $110,873.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 7 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 395.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $55,303.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 8 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1326.33.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $371,370.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue - 9 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 369.53.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,470.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.95.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,953.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 219.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,790.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1264.61.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $354,090.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Moraga Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 353.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,483.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 211.36.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,180.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Norris Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 633.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $177,370.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Norris Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 339.61.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $47,545.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Norris Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 618.23.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $173,105.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Norris Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 309.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $43,275.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 286.40.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,095.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Northrop Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1698.52.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $475,585.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Old Placerville Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 252.61.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $70,730.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Old Placerville Road – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 378.91.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $106,095.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 209.61.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,345.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 692.85.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $97,000.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 207.86.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $58,200.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 277.14.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,800.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 687.24.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $192,430.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 484.25.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $135,590.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 229.41.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,235.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.73.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,923.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 210.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,075.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 210.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,538.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 183.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,275.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Starburst Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 624.32.

Map Book Grid ID: H4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $174,810.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 561.85.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $157,320.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 674.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $188,785.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Tarshes Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 315.80.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,425.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: West Elkhorn Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 6322.54.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,770,310.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 314.72.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,060.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.60.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,405.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 317.20.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,408.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.23.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,573.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,170.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 369.50.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,460.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 240.14.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $67,240.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2375.08.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $665,025.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 9958.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $2,788,475.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1206.43

Map Book Grid ID: D5

Priority Network: No

Score: 2.8

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $168,900

Rank: 396

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.46.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,025.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 634.71.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,860.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Watt Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 370.25.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,835.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 177.96.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,830.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 508.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.8.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $142,365.

Rank: 396.

Street Name and Gap Number: 34Th Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 212.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,480.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 501.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $70,175.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 290.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,633.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 218.64.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,610.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 272.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,135.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Alta Arden Expressway – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 708.23.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $99,153.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Auburn Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 332.97.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $93,235.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 153.98.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $21,558.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bell Street – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 230.97.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $32,335.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: East Stockton Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 383.37.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $53,673.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: East Stockton Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 230.02.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,405.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: East Stockton Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 2070.20.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $289,828.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 729.79.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $102,170.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 762.70.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $213,555.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 410.68.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $57,495.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hemlock Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 314.65.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,050.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hillsdale Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 165.72.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,200.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 200.05.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,008.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 314.37.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,013.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 611.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $85,563.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 235.06.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $65,815.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 846.21.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $236,940.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1274.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $356,720.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 212.33.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,455.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Red Robin Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 160.27.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,438.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 27.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1476.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $206,750.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: U Street – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1699.49.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $237,930.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1380.68.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $193,295.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 338.04.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $47,325.

Rank: 523.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 817.39.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $228,870.

Rank: 552.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.60.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,650.

Rank: 552.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 190.93.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.7.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $53,460.

Rank: 552.

Street Name and Gap Number: Arden Way – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.79.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,650.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bruceville Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 439.45.

Map Book Grid ID: H4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $123,045.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Candace Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 381.86.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $106,920.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 715.63.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $200,375.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 825.73.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $231,205.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 950.17.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,025.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 475.09.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,513.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edison Avenue – 24.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 356.26.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,878.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,950.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1079.31.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $302,205.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 492.69.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $137,955.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 184.76.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,735.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 369.52.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,733.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 220.52.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,873.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 735.08.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $102,913.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 182.80.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,593.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 669.06.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $187,340.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 725.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $203,130.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 30.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 252.92.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $70,820.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 32.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 210.77.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,508.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 33.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 252.92.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,410.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 262.85.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,798.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Locust Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 177.94.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $49,825.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mills Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1130.68.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $316,590.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.16.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,563.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 494.85.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $69,278.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 668.79.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $187,260.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 182.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,535.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mission Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1155.18.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $161,725.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 185.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $26,003.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 371.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $52,005.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 185.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $26,003.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 278.60.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $39,005.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Palm Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 742.94.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $208,025.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sue Pam Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 609.63.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $170,695.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 459.29.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,303.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1033.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $289,355.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Unnamed Alley – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 298.12.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $41,738.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 185.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,918.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 485.88.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $136,045.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,170.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 805.73.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $225,605.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: Oak Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 669.19.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $93,688.

Rank: 555.

Street Name and Gap Number: College Oak Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 400.08.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $56,010.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: College Oak Drive – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 200.04.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,005.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: College Oak Drive – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 200.04.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,005.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 739.53.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,535.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.94.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,745.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1314.31.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $368,005.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2253.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $630,870.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 329.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $92,335.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Munroe Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 157.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $21,983.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,170.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 318.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,590.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 399.94.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $55,993.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1199.82.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $167,975.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 266.63.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,328.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1199.82.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $167,975.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 266.63.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,328.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1066.51.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $149,310.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sierra Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 397.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $55,583.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sierra Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 238.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,700.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: U Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2249.48.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $629,855.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: U Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 531.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,353.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: U Street – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 212.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,480.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: U Street – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 212.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.6.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,740.

Rank: 598.

Street Name and Gap Number: Antelope Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 274.88.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,485.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Barrett Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 448.23.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,753.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Barrett Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 192.10.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $26,893.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Barrett Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 256.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,858.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Barrett Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1408.71.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $197,220.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 184.73.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,863.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: California Avenue – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.67.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,670.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 401.19.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $56,165.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4680.52.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,310,545.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Don Julio Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1345.61.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $376,770.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Don Julio Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2594.40.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $726,430.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 474.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,465.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.25.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,155.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 712.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $99,700.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 629.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $176,180.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Edith Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 426.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $119,315.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,560.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 237.53.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,255.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Camino Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 410.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $57,400.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1160.95.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $162,533.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3132.87.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $877,205.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elm Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 5277.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,477,590.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Frida Maria Court – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 239.32.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,505.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 475.09.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,025.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 422.39.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,135.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,175.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 24.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 184.80.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,745.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 25.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,350.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 26.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 215.84.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $60,435.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 28.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 295.08.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $41,310.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 449.35.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,910.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 634.38.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,813.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1078.57.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $302,000.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1324.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $370,725.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 525.69.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,598.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 197.14.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,600.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 160.49.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,468.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 156.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $43,900.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue - 10 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 401.22.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $112,340.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 666.34.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $186,575.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue - 12 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 160.49.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,468.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 156.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $21,950.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 738.58.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $206,805.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kreth Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 373.08.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $52,233.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 360.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $100,845.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 520.24.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $145,665.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 188.03.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $52,650.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 282.04.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $39,485.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 705.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $98,715.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 235.04.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $32,905.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 239.32.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,505.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 957.27.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $268,035.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Lincoln Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2632.50.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $737,100.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: M Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,175.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: M Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 527.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,915.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: M Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,175.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marysville Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2561.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $717,155.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marysville Blvd – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4453.06.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,246,855.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue - 12 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.52.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,385.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Morse Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 528.41.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,978.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 286.40.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,095.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 238.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,825.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 165.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,140.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 165.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $46,280.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 165.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,140.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 495.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $69,418.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 330.56.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $46,278.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 330.56.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $92,555.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pasadena Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 165.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $23,140.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 573.54.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $160,590.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 401.48.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $112,415.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,605.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 210.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,070.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 210.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,535.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 421.92.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $118,140.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 527.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,838.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 421.92.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $118,140.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2456.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $687,705.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3812.32.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,067,450.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.24.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,153.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 210.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,075.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.24.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,153.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 210.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,538.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Robertson Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 331.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $46,400.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 308.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $86,420.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 205.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,805.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 240.05.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,608.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 205.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,805.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 205.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $28,805.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sheraton Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 391.97.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $54,875.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunrise Blvd – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 763.17.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $213,685.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 224.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $31,463.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 224.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $31,463.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 224.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,925.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: US 50 West Bound – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 587.50.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $82,250.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: West M Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2025.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $567,075.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: West M Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,175.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: West M Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,175.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walerga Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 636.45.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $89,103.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 237.86.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,300.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 317.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,400.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 264.76.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,130.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 404.23.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $56,593.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 485.07.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $67,910.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1161.13.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $325,115.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.34.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,168.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 491.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $68,775.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 245.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $68,775.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 245.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,388.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 245.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.55.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,388.

Rank: 621.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 24.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 256.48.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,908.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 25.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 256.48.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $71,815.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 26.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 351.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $98,385.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 27.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 175.69.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $24,598.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 29.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 263.36.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,740.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 195.98.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,438.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 690.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $193,310.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 459.29.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,303.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 918.59.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.5.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $257,205.

Rank: 731.

Street Name and Gap Number: 22nd Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2645.29.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $740,680.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Antelope Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1571.80.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $220,053.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Antelope Road – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 735.52.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $102,973.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bradshaw Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 641.39.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $179,590.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elk Grove Florin Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 654.02.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $183,125.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 370.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,808.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 633.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,655.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 527.70.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,878.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2942.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $823,760.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.89.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,945.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 369.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,445.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 342.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $47,900.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.81.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,933.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 329.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $92,335.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 197.86.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $55,400.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.18.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,985.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 29.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 295.08.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $41,310.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 31.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 168.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $47,210.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 348.43.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $97,560.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 278.74.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $78,050.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 209.06.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,268.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gunn Road – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 348.43.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $48,780.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 424.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,385.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: M Street – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 686.35.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $192,180.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Mackenzie Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 537.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $150,545.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 544.87.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $76,283.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1474.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $412,785.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 526.51.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,713.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 526.51.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $73,713.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Nadine Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 739.24.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $206,990.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1002.56.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $140,360.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 286.40.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $40,095.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: O Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 633.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $177,350.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pope Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,755.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 476.62.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,728.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.87.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,243.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 365.97.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,238.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2823.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $790,485.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.13.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,558.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.92.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,948.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.35.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,170.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 580.62.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $162,570.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 265.20.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,255.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 212.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,703.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 212.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,405.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 318.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,553.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 159.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,278.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 318.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $89,105.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 424.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,405.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 424.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,405.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 536.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $75,150.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 28.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 246.13.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,458.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 29.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 341.04.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $47,745.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 221.70.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $31,038.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 461.88.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $129,325.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 244.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,183.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 427.27.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,818.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 610.39.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $170,910.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 183.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,638.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 259.34.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,308.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: South Of Hanfield Drive At Montefalco Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 422.13.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $118,195.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: West Q Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1376.90.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $385,535.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 461.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,555.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 184.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,823.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 368.89.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,645.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 368.94.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,653.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.34.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,168.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,178.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1654.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $463,220.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Way – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 183.82.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.4.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $25,735.

Rank: 740.

Street Name and Gap Number: Airport Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4831.29.

Map Book Grid ID: B1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,352,760.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Airport Blvd West – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1676.08.

Map Book Grid ID: B1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $469,305.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bradshaw Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 811.86.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $113,660.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bradshaw Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1235.06.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $345,820.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bruceville Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 724.00.

Map Book Grid ID: H4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $202,720.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Chicago Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4125.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,155,125.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: El Centro Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3335.99.

Map Book Grid ID: C2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $934,080.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elverta Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 956.06.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $267,695.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Folsom Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 579.84.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $162,355.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Folsom Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 2220.51.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $310,870.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Freeport Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3587.03.

Map Book Grid ID: G3.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,004,365.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garden Hwy – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1674.58.

Map Book Grid ID: D2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $468,885.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jacinto Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3080.51.

Map Book Grid ID: H4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $862,545.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 26.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1641.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $459,565.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Old Placerville Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 378.91.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $106,095.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Old Placerville Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 315.76.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,208.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Old Placerville Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 947.28.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $132,620.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Old Placerville Road – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 252.61.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $35,365.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: San Juan Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4859.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,360,625.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Saverien Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 835.96.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $234,070.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: South Of Fisherman's Lake North Of Radio Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 6279.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,758,235.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Stewart Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 790.22.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $221,260.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunrise Blvd – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 922.83.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $129,195.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 337.11.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $47,195.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1011.34.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $283,175.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2732.09.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.35.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $764,985.

Rank: 810.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1707.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $238,980.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 32.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 731.57.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $204,840.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 263.43.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,880.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 332.70.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $46,578.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 549.70.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $153,915.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 24.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 246.19.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,468.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 25.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1066.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $298,715.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 265.54.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,175.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 159.32.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,305.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 584.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $163,570.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Pershing Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 159.32.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,305.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Phoenix Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1203.67.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $337,025.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 786.04.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.25.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $220,090.

Rank: 836.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 275.24.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,535.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cypress Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 220.19.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,828.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 369.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,723.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 369.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,445.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 240.00.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $33,600.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 185.33.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,895.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hope Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 599.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $167,845.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jacob Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 330.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $46,238.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Twin Cities Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 449.09.

Map Book Grid ID: K6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $62,873.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Tyrone Way - 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 369.51.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,465.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 276.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,733.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Walnut Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.36.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,170.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 31.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 372.78.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.2.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $52,190.

Rank: 849.

Street Name and Gap Number: 32nd Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 633.88.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $177,485.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Cameron Ranch Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 375.52.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $52,573.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1373.41.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $384,555.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Elkhorn Blvd – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 950.82.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,115.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hemlock Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 209.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,368.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hemlock Street – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 262.20.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $36,708.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.95.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,745.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 950.84.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,118.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1380.77.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $386,615.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 637.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $89,180.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 955.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $267,540.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Roseville Road – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1333.14.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $186,640.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: U Street – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1168.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.15.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $327,150.

Rank: 862.

Street Name and Gap Number: Antelope Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 440.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $61,615.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 217.92.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $30,510.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 696.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $194,885.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 588.94.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $82,453.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 524.34.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $146,815.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 28.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 155.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $21,818.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 29.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 155.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $43,635.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 31.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 233.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $32,725.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 33.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 440.62.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $61,688.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 34.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 293.75.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $41,125.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hickory Avenue - 2 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 159.65.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,705.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hickory Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 159.65.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,353.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hickory Avenue - 4 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1277.22.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $357,620.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hust Lane – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 346.73.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $97,085.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue - 14 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 641.96.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $89,875.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 530.22.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $148,460.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 742.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $103,923.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 11.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1378.57.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $193,000.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.62.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,948.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 199.62.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,948.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 665.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $93,155.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 791.95.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $110,873.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 631.82.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $176,910.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Martsmith Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 267.42.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,440.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marysville Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2686.28.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $752,160.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 643.93.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $180,300.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 198.13.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,738.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 693.47.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $194,170.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 247.67.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,673.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 184.95.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,785.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 19.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 267.42.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,440.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 427.88.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $119,805.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 21.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 320.91.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $89,855.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 22.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 213.94.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,953.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 23.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 267.42.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,880.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 24.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 462.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,773.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 25.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 264.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,025.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 26.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 528.75.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $74,025.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 27.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 462.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 2.1.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,773.

Rank: 875.

Street Name and Gap Number: 22nd Street – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2642.92.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $740,020.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 211.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $29,555.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 475.01.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $66,503.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Engle Road – 6.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.34.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,335.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 12.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 686.88.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $192,325.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 317.02.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,383.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 264.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,068.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 661.90.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $185,330.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garfield Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,595.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 316.60.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,325.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: North Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 158.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,325.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Q Street – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1267.78.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $177,490.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Rio Linda Blvd – 20.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1705.81.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $477,625.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 13.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 158.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,178.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 14.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 369.62.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $51,748.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Whitney Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 316.82.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.95.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,710.

Rank: 914.

Street Name and Gap Number: Airport Blvd – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4240.32.

Map Book Grid ID: B1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,187,290.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Bayou Way – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4697.80.

Map Book Grid ID: B1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,315,385.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Del Paso Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4557.34.

Map Book Grid ID: C2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,276,055.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 7.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1881.38.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $526,785.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Fair Oaks Blvd – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 277.89.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,905.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garden Hwy – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 10803.59.

Map Book Grid ID: C2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $3,025,005.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garden Hwy – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 11385.63.

Map Book Grid ID: D2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $3,187,975.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Gold Country Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 194.05.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $27,168.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 15.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 160.49.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $44,935.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Power Line Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 13915.99.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $3,896,475.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Power Line Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2279.20.

Map Book Grid ID: C2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $638,175.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Power Line Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 7233.72.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $2,025,445.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Prairie City Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 422.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C9.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $118,265.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Prairie City Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1684.36.

Map Book Grid ID: C9.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $471,620.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Prairie City Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4325.95.

Map Book Grid ID: C9.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,211,265.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: West El Camino Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 268.87.

Map Book Grid ID: D2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $37,643.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: White Rock Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 8925.75.

Map Book Grid ID: D8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $2,499,210.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Wilhaggin Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 375.88.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $52,623.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Winding Oak Drive – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1628.90.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $228,045.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Meiss Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 40017.42.

Map Book Grid ID: G10.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.9.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $11,204,875.

Rank: 930.

Street Name and Gap Number: Brannan Island Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3201.25.

Map Book Grid ID: O1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $896,350.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Brannan Island Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 32805.41.

Map Book Grid ID: O2.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $9,185,515.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Garden Hwy – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 37963.43.

Map Book Grid ID: B1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $10,629,760.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jackson Slough Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 7734.93.

Map Book Grid ID: O1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $2,165,780.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Jackson Slough Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 4793.79.

Map Book Grid ID: N1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $1,342,260.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Michigan Bar Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 21373.13.

Map Book Grid ID: F11.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $5,984,475.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Scott Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 41788.38.

Map Book Grid ID: E10.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $11,700,745.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Terminous Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 3420.77.

Map Book Grid ID: N1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $957,815.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Terminous Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 10958.06.

Map Book Grid ID: N1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $3,068,255.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Twitchell Island Road - 1 .

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2949.68.

Map Book Grid ID: O1.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $825,910.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: White Rock Road – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 10265.32.

Map Book Grid ID: D8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $2,874,290.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: White Rock Road – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 11402.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D9.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.75.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $3,192,620.

Rank: 950.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 435.85.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $122,035.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 272.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $38,138.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 163.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,883.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Central Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 326.89.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $91,530.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Eastern Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 629.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $88,090.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 243.86.

Map Book Grid ID: A8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,140.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 2.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 1707.01.

Map Book Grid ID: A8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $238,980.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 3.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 243.86.

Map Book Grid ID: A8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $34,140.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 4.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 487.72.

Map Book Grid ID: A8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $136,560.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Hazel Avenue – 5.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 609.65.

Map Book Grid ID: A8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $85,350.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 16.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 481.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $134,810.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 17.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 160.49.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,468.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Illinois Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 160.49.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $22,468.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Kenneth Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 424.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,385.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 8.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 475.17.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $133,045.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 9.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 1368.94.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $383,300.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Main Avenue – 10.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 421.21.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $58,970.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Marysville Blvd – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 516.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $144,590.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 18.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 427.88.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $59,903.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 28.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 1.

Length: (In feet.) 462.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $64,773.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: Sunset Avenue – 29.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 594.85.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $166,560.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: West Q Street - 1

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: 0.

Length: (In feet.) 2507.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Priority Network: No.

Score: 1.65.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $702,070.

Rank: 962.

Street Name and Gap Number: River Road – 1.

Sidewalk Currently on 1 or 0 Sides: Left blank.

Length: (In feet.) 2636.70.

Map Book Grid ID: L3.

Priority Network: Yes.

Score: No score.

Sidewalk Cost: (6 feet wide.) $369,138.

Rank: No rank.

Figure C-1. Recommended Pedestrian Facilities.

Shown here is the Sidewalk Gaps and Intersection Locator Grid. This is an overview of the entire map book given on one page. That is, a map of Sacramento County is shown, with another layer on top of the map consisting of a series of boxes that land on areas of Unincorporated Sacramento County. Each box, and thus each area found inside a box, is labelled with their map book grid ID. (For example, A1.) While

Sidewalk Gaps and Intersection Improvements are identified, other features identified include Pedestrian Districts, EJ Communities, Railways, Airports, Water bodies, and Parks.

A short description of the map book grid set up is as follows: Each set of ID's with the same starting letter lines up horizontally to form one row of boxes in the grid; each new set begins another row of boxes below the previous one. Sets of ID's with the same ending number line up vertically to form the columns in the grid. For reference, the following is a complete list of map book grid ID's for the Sidewalk Gaps and Intersection Locator Grid, going from left to right, and top to bottom:

A1, A2, A4, A5, A6, A8;
B1, B2, B3, B4, B5, B6, B7, B8;
C1, C2, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8, C9;
D2, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8, D9, D10;
E4, E5, E6, E10, E11;
F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F10, F11;
G3, G4, G5, G6, G7, G9, G10, G11;
H4, H7, H11;
I4, I6;
K6;
L2, L3;
M2;
N1, N2;
O1, and O2.

After this page, each succeeding page is a zoomed-in view of the map, starting with grid box A1, and going up to grid box O2. These series of maps focus on Pedestrian Facilities, with the following Pedestrian Features identified: Sidewalk Gaps, Interstate Ramps, Major Intersections, Medium Intersections, and Small Intersections. Other Features identified include Bus Stops, Pedestrian Districts, EJ Communities, Airports, Water bodies, and Parks.

Table C-6: Bicycle Recommendations:

Project ID will be listed first. Subsequent column headings will be stated as well.

Project ID: 804.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.
On Street: 47th Avenue.
From Street: 27th Street.
To Street: Wire Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 2.11.
Map Book Grid ID: D4.
Score: 4.7.
Cost Estimate: $4,353,620.
Rank: 1.

Project ID: 819.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.
On Street: Elkhorn Blvd.
From Street: West Elkhorn Blvd.
To Street: I 80 Westbound.
Length: (In Miles.) 7.39.
Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $15,212,850.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 820.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Elsie Avenue.

From Street: Stockton Blvd.

To Street: Cottonwood Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.55.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $3,197,350.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 831.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Fruitridge Road.

From Street: Martin Luther King Jr Blvd.

To Street: Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.19.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $2,458,745.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 840.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Madison Avenue.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Greenback Lane/ Lake Natoma Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 10.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $21,416,895.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 847.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Power Inn Road.

From Street: Lorin Avenue.

To Street: Geneva Pointe Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.27

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $6,730,515.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 854.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Stockton Blvd.

From Street: Riza Avenue.

To Street: East Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.57.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $5,294,190.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 865.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Watt Avenue.

From Street: South Watt Avenue/ Folsom Blvd.

To Street: Placer County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 12.46.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $25,665,445.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 827.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Florin Road.

From Street: Franklin Blvd.

To Street: Sunrise Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.35.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.7.

Cost Estimate: $3,264,953.

Rank: 1.

Project ID: 637.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 46th Street.

From Street: 47th Avenue.

To Street: Lang Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.45.

Cost Estimate: $15,770.

Rank: 11.

Project ID: 811.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Calvine Road.

From Street: Hwy 99 North bound.

To Street: Bader Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.67.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Score: 4.45.

Cost Estimate: $9,607,600.

Rank: 11.

Project ID: 198.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 44th Street.

From Street: Fruitridge Road.

To Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $1,112,950.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 375.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Iona Way.

From Street: Elsie Avenue.

To Street: Leilani Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.35.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $258,135.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 535.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Stevenson Avenue.

From Street: East Stockton Blvd.

To Street: Cottonwood Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.30.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $961,035.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 785.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Turnbridge Drive.

From Street: Franklin Blvd.

To Street: Chevy Chase Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.45.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $131,385.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 816.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: East Stockton Blvd.

From Street: South of Victory Avenue.

To Street: Power Inn Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.12.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $2,314,470.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 818.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: El Camino Avenue.

From Street: Connie Drive.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.98.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $10,250,415.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 832.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Fulton Avenue.

From Street: Sierra Blvd/ Munroe Street.

To Street: Auburn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.60.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $7,414,245.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 833.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Gerber Road.

From Street: Stockton Blvd.

To Street: Elk Grove Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.73.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $5,629,855.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 836.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Howe Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Marconi Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.99.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $6,150,785.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 843.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Myrtle Avenue.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Harrison Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $2,088,790.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 851.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Roseville Road.

From Street: East Border of City of Sacramento.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.93.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 4.4.

Cost Estimate: $3,977,720.

Rank: 13.

Project ID: 63.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Dry Creek Trail.

From Street: Ascot Avenue Trail.

To Street: Dry Creek Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.73.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 4.2.

Cost Estimate: $4,925,095.

Rank: 24.

Project ID: 737.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Navaho Drive.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Blackfoot Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.02.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 4.2.

Cost Estimate: $295,460.

Rank: 24.

Project ID: 826.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Greenback Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.37.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 4.2.

Cost Estimate: $4,870,680.

Rank: 24.

Project ID: 144.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Q Street Trail.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: 32nd Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,102,935.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 200.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 47th Street.

From Street: 47th Avenue.

To Street: Le Donne Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $296,415.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 219.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Andrea Blvd.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.45.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $334,985.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 335.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Galbrath Drive.

From Street: Larchmont Drive.

To Street: Walerga Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.66.
Map Book Grid ID: A5.
Score: 4.15.
Cost Estimate: $489,360.
Rank: 27.

Project ID: 380.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Jackson Street.
From Street: Myrtle Avenue.
To Street: Madison Avenue.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 4.15.
Cost Estimate: $366,270.
Rank: 27.

Project ID: 427.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Mcdermott Drive.
From Street: Elkhorn Blvd.
To Street: Galbrath Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.35.
Map Book Grid ID: A5.
Score: 4.15.
Cost Estimate: $261,780.
Rank: 27.

Project ID: 532.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sprig Drive.

From Street: Don Julio Blvd.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $279,350.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 645.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 37th Avenue.

From Street: 44th Street.

To Street: Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.83.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $240,290.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 707.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Iona Way.

From Street: Leilani Court.

To Street: Follett Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $38,360.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 769.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Sampson Blvd.

From Street: Fruitridge Road.

To Street: 47th Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $293,375.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 779.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Sprig Drive.

From Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

To Street: Golden Aspen Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $40,720.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 786.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Turnbury Drive.

From Street: Iona Way.

To Street: Summer Sky Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $126,720.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 787.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Turner Drive.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Larchmont Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $117,755.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 794.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Weddigen Way.

From Street: Gothberg Avenue.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $74,280.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 121.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

From Street: Franklin Blvd.

To Street: Burdett Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.76.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.15.

Cost Estimate: $2,882,785.

Rank: 27.

Project ID: 627.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elk Grove Florin Road.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: Calvine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 4.1.

Cost Estimate: $476,600.

Rank: 41.

Project ID: 721.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Lemon Hill Avenue.

From Street: 44th Street.

To Street: Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.1.

Cost Estimate: $268,825.

Rank: 41.

Project ID: 855.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Stockton Blvd.

From Street: Young Street.

To Street: 435 feet South of Mcmahon Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.46.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 4.1.

Cost Estimate: $944,075.

Rank: 41.

Project ID: 828.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Folsom Blvd.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.06.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 4.

Cost Estimate: $6,310,585.

Rank: 44.

Project ID: 81.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Florin Creek Trail.

From Street: Palmer House Drive.

To Street: Florin Perkins Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.05.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $2,693,345.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 166.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Watt Avenue Paseo Trail.

From Street: Freedom Park Drive.

To Street: U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.96.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $3,199,950.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 228.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Auberry Drive.

From Street: Spengler Drive.

To Street: Geneva Pointe Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $223,680.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 443.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Morse Avenue.

From Street: El Camino Avenue.

To Street: Marconi Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $373,825.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 466.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Orange Grove Avenue.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $752,385.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 510.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Robertson Avenue.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.95.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $2,180,525.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 646.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 41st Avenue.

From Street: Franklin Blvd.

To Street: 44th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.74.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $215,785.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 807.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Arden Way.

From Street: Ethan Way.

To Street: Morse Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $2,956,815.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 822.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Pine Garden Lane.

To Street: Palm Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.17.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $12,699,570.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 842.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Marconi Avenue.

From Street: Howe Avenue.

To Street: Palm Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.69.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $9,666,095.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 849.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Q Street.

From Street: 18th Street.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.11.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $4,348,810.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 863.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Walerga Road.

From Street: Antelope Road.

To Street: Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $1,378,975.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 81.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Florin Creek Trail.

From Street: Palmer House Drive.

To Street: Power Inn Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.95.

Cost Estimate: $2,693,345.

Rank: 45.

Project ID: 478.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palmer House Drive.

From Street: Skander Way.

To Street: Gerber Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.9.

Cost Estimate: $271,050.

Rank: 58.

Project ID: 54.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Calvine Road Trail.

From Street: Bruceville Road.

To Street: Calvine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.39.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $1,122,595.

Rank: 59.

Project ID: 204.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 66th Avenue.

From Street: 55th Street.

To Street: Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $551,780.

Rank: 59.

Project ID: 231.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Auburn Blvd.

From Street: Bus 80 East Bound.

To Street: Manzanita Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 5.15.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $3,806,555.

Rank: 59.

Project ID: 368.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hurley Way.

From Street: Oak Terrace Court.

To Street: Crisp Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $203,455.

Rank: 59.

Project ID: 431.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Meadowhaven Drive.

From Street: Power Inn Road.

To Street: Pixley Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $85,620.

Rank: 59.

Project ID: 632.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Greenback Lane.

From Street: I 80 West Bound.

To Street: Freedom Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 3.8.

Cost Estimate: $90,520.

Rank: 59.

Project ID: 41.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Arcade Creek Trail.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Clearwater Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.64.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $2,690,965.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 214.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Almond Avenue.

From Street: Pershing Ave .

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.13.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $1,573,750.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 235.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Beech Avenue.

From Street: Pershing Avenue.

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.01.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $1,484,455.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 263.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Chestnut Avenue.

From Street: Pershing Avenue.

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.04.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $1,508,700.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 318.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Engle Road.

From Street: Winston Way.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Length: (In Miles.) 1.12.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 3.75.
Cost Estimate: $826,590.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 326.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Filbert Avenue.
From Street: Pershing Avenue.
To Street: Oak Avenue.
Length: (In Miles.) 2.04.
Map Book Grid ID: A6.
Score: 3.75.
Cost Estimate: $1,509,930.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 338.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Gibbons Drive.
From Street: Walnut Avenue.
To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.97.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 3.75.
Cost Estimate: $715,900.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 348.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Grant Avenue.

From Street: Sue Pam Drive.

To Street: Grant Avenue Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.99.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $729,195.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 408.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Locust Avenue.

From Street: Walnut Avenue.

To Street: Manzanita Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.98.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $722,615.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 533.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Stanley Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Marshall Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $742,330.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 542.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sutter Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Hollister Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $1,111,895.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 548.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Trajan Drive.

From Street: Greenback Lane.

To Street: Central Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $492,600.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 615.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Wittenham Way.

From Street: Greenback Lane.

To Street: Woodlake Hills Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $269,620.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 714.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: La Sierra Drive.

From Street: La Brea Way.

To Street: Arden Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.76.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $511,365.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 726.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Marilona Drive.

From Street: Kings Way.

To Street: Marconi Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $111,445.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 800.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Winding Creek Road.

From Street: Cottage Way.

To Street: Cathay Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.07.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $309,760.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 805.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Arden Way.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Arden Way Connector. (Additional.)

Length: (In Miles.) 2.70.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $5,564,125.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 817.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Eastern Avenue.

From Street: Arden Way.

To Street: El Camino Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.01.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $2,084,715.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 824.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Wayside Lane.

To Street: Crestline Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.08.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $6,352,455.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 825.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Manzanita Avenue.

To Street: Wayside Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.75.

Cost Estimate: $206,085.

Rank: 65.

Project ID: 841.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Manzanita Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Auburn Blvd.
Length: (In Miles.) 2.52.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 3.75.
Cost Estimate: $5,181,595.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 864.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Walnut Avenue.
From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.
To Street: Winding Way.
Length: (In Miles.) 3.41.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 3.75.
Cost Estimate: $7,017,160.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 866.
Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.
On Street: Winding Way.
From Street: Walnut Avenue.
To Street: Dewey Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 2.13.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 3.75.
Cost Estimate: $4,394,170.
Rank: 65.

Project ID: 5.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Power Inn Road.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: Florin Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $396,740.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 74.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elkhorn Trail.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Patrol Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.17.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,921,875.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 167.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Watt Avenue.

From Street: Watt Avenue/ U P R R Crossing.

To Street: Watt Avenue/ U P R R Crossing.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $303,005.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 182.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Service Road.

From Street: Industry Drive.

To Street: Orange Grove Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $139,510.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 185.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Don Julio Blvd Extension.

From Street: 32nd Street.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $367,285.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 206.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: A Street.

From Street: Skvarla Avenue.

To Street: San Vincente Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $410,955.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 224.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Arnold Avenue.

From Street: Dudley Blvd.

To Street: James Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $712,105.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 232.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bannister Road.

From Street: Bannister Bike Trail.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.76.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $563,210.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 300.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: East Pkwy.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: Circle Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $114,170.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 358.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hemlock Street.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Palm Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $369,585.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 381.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: James Way.

From Street: Dudley Blvd.

To Street: A Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $115,890.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 477.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palm Street.

From Street: Dudley Blvd.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $161,170.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 486.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Peacekeeper Way.

From Street: Dudley Blvd.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.29.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $213,740.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 503.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Reese Road.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: Gerber Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.99.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $735,080.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 679.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Circle Pkwy.

From Street: East Pkwy.

To Street: Orange Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.68.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $197,935.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 703.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Hernando Road.

From Street: Gwen Drive.

To Street: Fulton Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.18.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $51,840.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 723.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Loucreta Drive.

From Street: Palmer House Drive.

To Street: Power Inn Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $94,655.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 777.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Skvarla Avenue.

From Street: A Street.

To Street: Rafferty Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $109,420.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 801.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Wings Way.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Poplar Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $69,000.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 810.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Bradshaw Road.

From Street: Folsom Blvd.

To Street: 2400 feet North of Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.62.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $5,402,220.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 844.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Oak Avenue.

From Street: Kenneth Avenue.

To Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.70.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $5,567,395.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 853.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: San Juan Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.89.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.7.

Cost Estimate: $3,888,040.

Rank: 88.

Project ID: 708.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Iowa Avenue.

From Street: 42nd Street.

To Street: Vista Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.43.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $125,800.

Rank: 110.

Project ID: 813.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Cottonwood Lane.

From Street: Elsie Avenue.

To Street: Stevenson Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.65.

Cost Estimate: $1,243,700.

Rank: 110.

Project ID: 624.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dewey Drive.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Dunmore Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.63.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.6.

Cost Estimate: $258,355.

Rank: 112.

Project ID: 631.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Greenback Lane.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Chestnut Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.74.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 3.6.

Cost Estimate: $433,540.

Rank: 112.

Project ID: 290.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Don Julio Blvd.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Walerga Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.34.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $989,780.

Rank: 114.

Project ID: 362.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hillsdale Blvd.

From Street: Andrea Blvd.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $166,710.

Rank: 114.

Project ID: 446.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Munroe Street.

From Street: Huntington Road.

To Street: Fulton Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $325,660.

Rank: 114.

Project ID: 512.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Roseville Road.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Airbase Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $104,520.

Rank: 114.

Project ID: 559.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: U Street.

From Street: 24th Street.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.43.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $1,058,455.

Rank: 114.

Project ID: 812.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Cosumnes River Blvd.

From Street: Calvine Road Trail.

To Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 3.55.

Cost Estimate: $277,445.

Rank: 114.

Project ID: 311.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Ellerslee Drive.

From Street: Manzanita Avenue.

To Street: Rutland Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $116,045.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 404.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Landis Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: California Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $280,115.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 407.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Linda Sue Way.

From Street: Dewey Drive.

To Street: Hammond Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.63.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $467,175.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 473.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palm Avenue.

From Street: Heritage Drive.

To Street: Dewey Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $293,450.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 474.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palm Avenue.

From Street: Garfield Avenue.

To Street: Manzanita Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $375,810.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 476.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palm Drive.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: California Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $279,210.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 515.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Rutland Drive.

From Street: Templeton Drive.

To Street: Palm Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $358,925.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 602.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Marconi Avenue.

From Street: Westwood Lane.

To Street: Westwood Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $11,155.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 635.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: South Watt Avenue.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.96.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $469,195.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 704.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Hilltop Drive.

From Street: Manzanita Avenue.

To Street: Parkoaks Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $190,115.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 739.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Nonnie Avenue.

From Street: Hackberry Lane.

To Street: Manzanita Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $74,955.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 743.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Oleander Drive.

From Street: Saint James Drive.

To Street: Palm Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $91,125.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 799.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Will Rogers Drive.

From Street: Dewey Drive.

To Street: Papaya Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $95,995.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 823.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Don Way.

To Street: Wayside Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $311,410.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 635.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: South Watt Avenue.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.96.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $469,195.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 989.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: 10500 Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.20.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 3.5.

Cost Estimate: $419,945.

Rank: 120.

Project ID: 80.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Florin Creek Trail.

From Street: Palmer House Drive.

To Street: Palmer House Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.77.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $1,257,800.

Rank: 136.

Project ID: 441.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Morse Avenue.

From Street: Arden Way.

To Street: Alta Arden Expressway.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $200,055.

Rank: 136.

Project ID: 527.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sky Pkwy.

From Street: North Pkwy.

To Street: 65th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.94.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.45.

Cost Estimate: $697,785.

Rank: 136.

Project ID: 147.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Robla Creek Trail.

From Street: Channing Drive.

To Street: Elkhorn Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.77.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,259,805.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 203.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 65th Street.

From Street: Stockton Blvd.

To Street: Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $460,260.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 215.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Alta Arden Expressway.

From Street: Fulton Avenue.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.02.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $751,590.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 369.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hurley Way.

From Street: Ethan Way.

To Street: Dealynn Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $419,690.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 444.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Morse Avenue.

From Street: Marconi Avenue.

To Street: Auburn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.08.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $801,950.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 493.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pope Avenue.

From Street: Fulton Avenue.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $739,300.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 513.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Roseville Road.

From Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

To Street: Antelope Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.24.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $914,470.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 531.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Spengler Drive.

From Street: Stevenson Avenue.

To Street: Auberry Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.77.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $565,650.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 620.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Arden Way.

From Street: Morse Avenue.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $79,235.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 629.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Garfield Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Greenback Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 5.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $854,210.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 664.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Blackfoot Way.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Pima Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.58.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $167,255.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 675.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Chenu Avenue.

From Street: Morse Avenue.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.35.

Cost Estimate: $109,010.

Rank: 139.

Project ID: 856.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Stockton Blvd.

From Street: 14th Avenue.

To Street: 21st Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.56.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.3.

Cost Estimate: $1,160,885.

Rank: 151.

Project ID: 117.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mayhew Drain Trail.

From Street: Mayhew Road.

To Street: South American River Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.46.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $749,570.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 253.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: California Avenue.

From Street: Kenneth Avenue.

To Street: Landis Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.88.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $646,825.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 254.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: California Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Jan Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $274,685.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 313.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elm Avenue.

From Street: Almond Hill Court.

To Street: Main Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.95.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $1,438,845.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 319.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Engle Road.

From Street: Norris Avenue.

To Street: Bausell Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $238,370.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 327.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Florin Perkins Road.

From Street: Specialty Circle.

To Street: Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.45.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $334,875.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 455.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Norris Avenue.

From Street: Clairidge Way.

To Street: Auburn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.29.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $954,645.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 610.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Winding Way.

From Street: Central Avenue.

To Street: Hazel Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.36.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $1,742,795.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 734.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Mirandy Drive.

From Street: Huntsman Drive.

To Street: Mayhew Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.54.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $156,480.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 747.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Palm Drive.

From Street: California Avenue.

To Street: San Lorenzo Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $162,225.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 757.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Rampart Drive.

From Street: Barrett Road.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.80.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $232,820.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 839.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Thornhill Drive.

To Street: Bradshaw Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $3,263,210.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 852.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: South Watt Avenue.

From Street: Folsom Blvd.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.05.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $2,159,380.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 990.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pennsylvania Avenue.

From Street: Magnolia Avenue.

To Street: Lemon Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 3.25.

Cost Estimate: $281,294.

Rank: 152.

Project ID: 296.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dudley Blvd.

From Street: Winona Way/ U P R R Crossing.

To Street: 34th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.54.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $1,141,595.

Rank: 166.

Project ID: 650.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 44th Street.

From Street: 26th Avenue.

To Street: Fruitridge Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.2.

Cost Estimate: $66,935.

Rank: 166.

Project ID: 161.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Teichert Conveyor Trail.

From Street: Kiefer Blvd.

To Street: Folsom Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.10.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $9,984,360.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 315.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: West Elverta Road.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.84.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $2,839,210.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 387.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kenneth Avenue.

From Street: Mission Avenue.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,061,300.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 388.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kenneth Avenue.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Greenback Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.34.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,732,575.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 406.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Lincoln Avenue.

From Street: Manzanita Avenue.

To Street: San Juan Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,446,790.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 416.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Main Avenue.

From Street: Greenback Lane.

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.50.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,106,695.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 437.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mission Avenue.

From Street: El Camino Avenue.

To Street: Engle Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.51.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,113,245.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 456.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: North Avenue.

From Street: Mission Avenue.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.46.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,080,195.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 487.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pecan Avenue.

From Street: Pershing Avenue.

To Street: Elm Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.53.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,134,235.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 625.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Eastern Avenue.

From Street: Whitney Avenue.

To Street: Edison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $61,310.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 806.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Ethan Way.

From Street: Exposition Blvd.

To Street: Alta Arden Expressway.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $181,250.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 821.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Ethan Way.

From Street: Hurley Way.

To Street: Arden Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.15.

Cost Estimate: $1,008,270.

Rank: 168.

Project ID: 27.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elder Creek Trail.

From Street: Waterman Trail.

To Street: Elk Grove Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.53.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $871,440.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 40.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Arcade Creek Trail.

From Street: Garfield Avenue.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $602,770.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 55.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Calvine Road Trail.

From Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

To Street: East Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $191,860.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 163.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Union Pacific Railroad Trail.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: Mccomber Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $835,750.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 199.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 47th Avenue.

From Street: Wire Drive.

To Street: Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $54,100.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 202.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 55th Street.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: 66th Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $187,190.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 284.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Date Avenue.

From Street: Myrtle Avenue.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $365,590.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 361.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hillsdale Blvd.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Frizell Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $115,315.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 413.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: M Street.

From Street: West M Street.

To Street: Oak Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $737,185.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 449.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: North Market Blvd.

From Street: Northgate Blvd.

To Street: Gateway Park Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.48.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,094,025.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 541.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sunset Avenue.

From Street: Isabella Avenue.

To Street: Main Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.55.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $3,364,015.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 544.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tallyho Drive.

From Street: Kiefer Blvd.

To Street: Kiefer Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.17.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $861,335.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 613.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Winona Way.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $305,000.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 662.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Bell Street.

From Street: Marconi Avenue.

To Street: Edison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $107,770.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 815.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Douglas Road.

From Street: Mather Blvd.

To Street: Rancho Cordova's West Boundary.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.66.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 3.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,349,270.

Rank: 180.

Project ID: 96.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Hedge Avenue.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Elder Creek Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.77.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $2,903,315.

Rank: 195.

Project ID: 270.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: College Oak Drive.

From Street: Myrtle Avenue.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $370,140.

Rank: 195.

Project ID: 411.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Longview Drive.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $830,260.

Rank: 195.

Project ID: 459.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Northrop Avenue.

From Street: Enterprise Drive.

To Street: Howe Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $89,415.

Rank: 195.

Project ID: 475.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palm Avenue.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Palm Avenue Overcrossing.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.03.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.05.

Cost Estimate: $762,805.

Rank: 195.

Project ID: 69.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elder Creek Trail.

From Street: Elk Grove.

To Street: SR 99.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.49.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $6,660,495.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 189.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 10th Street.

From Street: Q Street.

To Street: U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.46.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $338,700.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 233.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Barrett Road.

From Street: Lincoln Avenue.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.61.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $448,225.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 283.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Curved Bridge Road.

From Street: Dry Creek Road.

To Street: Oak Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $270,155.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 334.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: G Street.

From Street: 10th Street.

To Street: 16th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $554,250.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 364.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hollister Avenue.

From Street: Grant Avenue.

To Street: Lincoln Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $552,820.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 378.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Jackson Road.

From Street: Thornhill Drive.

To Street: Excelsior Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.89.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $2,876,595.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 511.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Rogue River Drive.

From Street: Whitewater Way.

To Street: La Riviera Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $349,090.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 536.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Stollwood Drive.

From Street: Lincoln Avenue.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $551,085.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 553.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: La Riviera Drive.

From Street: Tuolumne Drive.

To Street: Tuolumne Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $431,520.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 713.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Kingsbridge Drive.

From Street: Bothwell Drive.

To Street: Calvine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.74.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $215,800.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 722.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Linda Rio Drive.

From Street: La Riviera Drive.

To Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.79.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $230,205.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 752.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Perth Way.

From Street: Palm Drive.

To Street: Marlynn Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 3.

Cost Estimate: $26,685.

Rank: 200.

Project ID: 829.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Franklin Blvd.

From Street: 38th Avenue.

To Street: Franklin Blvd.
Length: (In Miles.) 2.40.
Map Book Grid ID: D4.
Score: 3.
Cost Estimate: $4,934,135.
Rank: 200.

Project ID: 995.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Whitney Avenue.
From Street: Watt Avenue.
To Street: Sue Pam Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 2.75.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 3.
Cost Estimate: $2,037,818.
Rank: 200.

Project ID: 112.
Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.
On Street: Laguna Creek Trail.
From Street: Calvine Road.
To Street: Crystal Creek Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 1.82.
Map Book Grid ID: E5.
Score: 2.95.
Cost Estimate: $5,071,645.
Rank: 215.

Project ID: 129.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Out of Scope – Within City Limit.

From Street: West of Watt Avenue.

To Street: Fulton Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.84.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $1,382,850.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 149.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Sacramento Northern Trail.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.47.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $2,401,195.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 157.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: South American River Trail.

From Street: Escobar Way Connector.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.55.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $4,167,135.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 671.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Canberra Drive.

From Street: South Watt Avenue.

To Street: Thornhill Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $130,115.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 803.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Woodlake Hills Drive.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Foxfire Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.53.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $153,310.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 838.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Reith Court.

To Street: Rosemont Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $1,341,740.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 860.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: West Elkhorn Blvd.

From Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

To Street: Waterside Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.37.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $9,004,785.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 171.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: WPA Powerline Trail.

From Street: Hazel Avenue.

To Street: Wachtel Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.36.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $5,527,485.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 171.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: WPA Powerline Trail.

From Street: Bladen Court.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.92.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.95.

Cost Estimate: $5,527,485.

Rank: 215.

Project ID: 6.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Nicholas Park Connection.

From Street: 44th Street.

To Street: 46th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $384,605.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 8.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: 50th Avenue.

From Street: 46th Street.

To Street: Steiner Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $608,605.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 345.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Gothberg Avenue.

From Street: Larchmont Drive.

To Street: Weddigen Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $196,975.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 386.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kenneth Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: California Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $279,315.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 674.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Cathay Way.

From Street: Winding Creek Road.

To Street: Rockwood Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $27,530.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 695.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Golden Aspen Drive.

From Street: Sprig Drive.

To Street: Mcdermott Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $28,265.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 709.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Iowa Avenue.

From Street: Vista Avenue.

To Street: Sampson Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.06.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $17,600.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 718.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Larry Way.

From Street: Bruce Way.

To Street: Don Julio Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $143,820.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 751.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Persimmon Avenue.

From Street: La Mancha Way.

To Street: Pomegranate Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $88,545.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 762.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Robert Frost Way.

From Street: Oakhollow Drive.

To Street: Hillsdale Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $73,035.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 763.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Rockwood Drive.

From Street: Maple Glen Road.

To Street: Eastern Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.17.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $48,445.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 767.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Rutland Drive.

From Street: Ellerslee Drive.

To Street: Templeton Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $36,845.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 782.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Summer Sky Drive.

From Street: Turnbury Drive.

To Street: Bastien Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $20,705.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 809.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Auburn Blvd.

From Street: Manzanita Avenue.

To Street: Villa M H P.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.9.

Cost Estimate: $112,325.

Rank: 225.

Project ID: 12.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Douglas Road.

From Street: Mather Blvd.

To Street: Folsom South Canal Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,044,285.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 31.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Rogers Road Utility Corridor.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: Wolfe Heights Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.18.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,935,035.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 70.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elder Creek Trail.

From Street: Waterman Trail.

To Street: Kiefer Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 8.17.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $13,366,170.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 221.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Antelope Road.

From Street: Antelope North Road.

To Street: Mango Tree Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.87.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $644,695.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 251.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Butterfield Way.

From Street: Stoughton Way.

To Street: Butterfield L R T Station.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $185,695.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 294.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dry Creek Road.

From Street: Ascot Avenue.

To Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.56.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,891,520.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 447.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Myrtle Avenue.

From Street: I 80 East Bound.

To Street: College Oak Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.89.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $656,810.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 482.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pasadena Avenue.

From Street: Cypress Avenue.

To Street: Auburn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.85.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $630,990.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 596.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walnut Avenue.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.03.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,503,325.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 630.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Greenback Lane.

From Street: Chestnut Avenue.

To Street: Main Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $39,555.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 837.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Kenneth Avenue.

From Street: Elm Avenue.

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,033,130.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 862.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Wachtel Way.

From Street: Oak Avenue.

To Street: Old Auburn Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.12.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,305,720.

Rank: 239.

Project ID: 286.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Del Paso Road.

From Street: East Levee Road.

To Street: Professor Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.94.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 2.8.

Cost Estimate: $697,335.

Rank: 251.

Project ID: 291.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Don Julio Blvd.

From Street: Redhead Way.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.08.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.8.

Cost Estimate: $55,845.

Rank: 251.

Project ID: 304.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Centro Road.

From Street: Alcantar Circle.

To Street: Witter Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 2.8.

Cost Estimate: $581,310.

Rank: 251.

Project ID: 337.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Gerber Road.

From Street: Elk Grove Florin Road.

To Street: Bradshaw Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.8.

Cost Estimate: $1,485,555.

Rank: 251.

Project ID: 859.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Vineyard Road.

From Street: Gerber Road.

To Street: Calvine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.00.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.8.

Cost Estimate: $4,121,930.

Rank: 251.

Project ID: 308.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elder Creek Road.

From Street: South Watt Avenue.

To Street: Excelsior Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.91.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.75.

Cost Estimate: $2,893,420.

Rank: 256.

Project ID: 38.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Arcade Creek Trail.

From Street: Auburn Blvd.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.03.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,685,275.

Rank: 257.

Project ID: 39.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Arcade Creek Trail.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Garfield Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.06.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,738,210.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 56.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cottage Park Trail.

From Street: Cottage Way.

To Street: Morse Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $234,085.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 110.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Excelsior Road.

To Street: Bradshaw Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.45.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $4,011,710.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 153.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Santa Anita Park Trail.

From Street: Hernando Road.

To Street: Bell Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $542,790.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 269.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: College Oak Drive.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Sycamore Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $4,215.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 439.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Montclaire Street.

From Street: Marconi Avenue.

To Street: Whitney Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $553,130.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 442.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Morse Avenue.

From Street: Cottage Park Trail.

To Street: El Camino Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $272,250.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 457.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: North Pkwy.

From Street: Sky Pkwy.

To Street: Steiner Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $242,880.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 657.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Aztec Way.

From Street: Navaho Drive.

To Street: Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $104,965.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 658.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Beauregard Way.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Skyridge Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $164,505.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 712.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Kings Way.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Maryal Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.64.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $186,565.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 790.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Verner Avenue.

From Street: Walnut Avenue.

To Street: Garfield Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $173,905.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 792.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Walnut Avenue.

From Street: Palm Avenue.

To Street: Verner Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.34.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.7.

Cost Estimate: $97,545.

Rank: 258.

Project ID: 86.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Garden Hwy.

From Street: I 80 East Bound.

To Street: North Bayou Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 7.84.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $12,840,040.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 142.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Power Line Road.

From Street: Garden Hwy.

To Street: West Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.44.

Map Book Grid ID: A2.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $7,262,965.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 324.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Excelsior Road.

From Street: Air Tower Road.

To Street: Woodring Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $492,655.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 340.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Goethe Road.

From Street: Mayhew Road.

To Street: Bradshaw Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.53.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $394,900.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 353.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hackberry Lane.

From Street: Cypress Avenue.

To Street: Nichora Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.96.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $712,760.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 428.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mckay Street.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Treecrest Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $232,790.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 483.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pasadena Avenue.

From Street: Auburn Blvd.

To Street: Edison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $872,120.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 520.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Saverien Drive.

From Street: American River Drive.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.34.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $254,425.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 636.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

From Street: Oak Avenue Pkwy.

To Street: Dowd Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.52.

Map Book Grid ID: A7.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $82,555.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 655.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Ashton Drive.

From Street: North River Way.

To Street: Saverien Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $185,185.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 686.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: East Pkwy.

From Street: Circle Pkwy.

To Street: A Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $14,765.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 750.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Pennsylvania Avenue.

From Street: Sacramento Bar Beach Access.

To Street: Magnolia Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $67,215.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 850.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

From Street: Ascot Avenue Trail.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.65.

Cost Estimate: $2,161,345.

Rank: 271.

Project ID: 604.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Wilbur Way.

From Street: Gerber Road.

To Street: Elsie Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.53.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $393,650.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 640.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 23rd Avenue.

From Street: Warwick Avenue.

To Street: 42nd Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $74,340.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 643.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 35th Avenue.

From Street: Martin Luther King Jr Blvd.

To Street: Mendocino Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $44,605.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 651.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 44th Street.

From Street: 14th Avenue.

To Street: 20th Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.35.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $102,475.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 661.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Bell Street.

From Street: Arden Way.

To Street: El Camino Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.01.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $294,275.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 717.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Larchmont Drive.

From Street: Walerga Road.

To Street: Don Julio Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $76,120.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 772.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: San Vincente Way.

From Street: A Street.

To Street: Santa Fe Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $14,585.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 774.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Santa Fe Way.

From Street: San Vincente Way.

To Street: Karl Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.48.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.6.

Cost Estimate: $140,090.

Rank: 284.

Project ID: 10.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Jackson Road.

From Street: Excelsior Road.

To Street: South Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.19.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.55.

Cost Estimate: $6,854,830.

Rank: 292.

Project ID: 113.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

From Street: Saddle Creek Drive.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 5.97.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.
Score: 2.55.
Cost Estimate: $10,463,115.
Rank: 292.

Project ID: 322.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Ethan Way.
From Street: Arden Way.
To Street: El Camino Avenue.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.98.
Map Book Grid ID: C4.
Score: 2.55.
Cost Estimate: $723,380.
Rank: 292.

Project ID: 341.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Gold Express Drive.
From Street: Sunrise Blvd.
To Street: Gold Rush Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.43.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Score: 2.55.
Cost Estimate: $319,400.
Rank: 292.

Project ID: 480.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palmerson Drive.

From Street: Swindon Way.

To Street: North Loop Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.55.

Cost Estimate: $113,600.

Rank: 292.

Project ID: 492.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Poker Lane.

From Street: Don Julio Blvd.

To Street: Antelope North Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.94.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.55.

Cost Estimate: $696,825.

Rank: 292.

Project ID: 517.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: San Juan Road.

From Street: El Centro Road.

To Street: Garden Hwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 2.55.

Cost Estimate: $822,970.

Rank: 292.

Project ID: 33.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Del Norte Club Connection.

From Street: Clairidge Oak Court.

To Street: Hancock Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $110,225.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 62.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Del Campo Park Trail.

From Street: Moraga Drive.

To Street: Crestview Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $461,625.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 68.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: El Modena Avenue.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 1.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.76.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $1,241,860.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 76.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: Cherry Brook Drive.

To Street: El Modena Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.08.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $3,403,030.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 128.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Oleander Drive Connection.

From Street: Oleander Drive.

To Street: Del Campo Park Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $240,935.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 260.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Central Avenue.

From Street: Woodmore Oaks Drive.

To Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.30.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $2,439,905.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 280.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Crestview Drive.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Jan Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $234,715.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 382.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Jan Drive.

From Street: Jan Drive Trail.

To Street: California Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $193,880.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 383.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Jan Drive.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Crestview Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $186,815.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 420.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Marshall Avenue.

From Street: Sutter Avenue.

To Street: Lincoln Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $369,625.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 440.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Moraga Drive.

From Street: Jan Drive.

To Street: Dewey Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B5
Score: 2.5.
Cost Estimate: $412,350.
Rank: 299.

Project ID: 450.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: National Drive.
From Street: Del Paso Road.
To Street: North Market Blvd.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.
Map Book Grid ID: B3.
Score: 2.5.
Cost Estimate: $481,990.
Rank: 299.

Project ID: 488.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Pershing Avenue.
From Street: Kenneth Avenue.
To Street: Illinois Avenue.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Score: 2.5.
Cost Estimate: $371,755.
Rank: 299.

Project ID: 518.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

From Street: Central Avenue.

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.95.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $700,815.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 552.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tuckeroo Way.

From Street: Gum Ranch Drive.

To Street: Treecrest Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.63.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $468,020.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 575.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Van Alstine Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: California Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $279,410.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 668.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Bridge Street.

From Street: Temescal Street.

To Street: Howard Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $26,325.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 677.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Chica Way.

From Street: Berrendo Drive.

To Street: Las Pasas Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $21,765.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 678.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Chicago Avenue.

From Street: Kaula Drive.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $90,935.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 690.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Crestline Avenue.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $79,795.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 692.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Foxfire Drive.

From Street: Woodlake Hills Drive.

To Street: Trajan Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $78,210.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 711.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Kaula Drive.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Chicago Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.47.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $135,495.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 727.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Marlynn Street.

From Street: Perth Way.

To Street: Stanley Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $52,890.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 742.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Old Winding Way.

To Street: Old Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $63,925.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 746.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Oxwood Drive.

From Street: Tallyho Drive.

To Street: Roseport Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $13,740.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 764.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Roseport Way.

From Street: Oxwood Drive.

To Street: Mayhew Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.34.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $99,575.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 791.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: West Delano Street.

From Street: Delano Street.

To Street: Elwyn Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $43,375.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 795.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Westcamp Road.

From Street: End of Street.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $37,135.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 858.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Sunrise Blvd.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.66.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.5.

Cost Estimate: $3,412,045.

Rank: 299.

Project ID: 43.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Arnold Avenue Trail.

From Street: Peacekeeper Way.

To Street: Palm Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $536,665.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 132.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Palm Avenue.

From Street: Palm Avenue Overcrossing.

To Street: Palm Avenue Overcrossing.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $166,935.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 184.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Industry Drive.

From Street: Winona Way.

To Street: Service Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $202,060.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 255.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Auburn Blvd.

From Street: Caravan Village M H P.

To Street: Caravan Village M H P.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $9,870.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 354.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hackberry Lane.

From Street: Hackberry Lane.

To Street: Palm Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $748,290.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 385.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Keema Avenue.

From Street: Walerga Road.

To Street: Longdale Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $284,125.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 399.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: La Cienega Drive.

From Street: Larchmont Drive.

To Street: Don Julio Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.35.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $257,415.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 494.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Poplar Blvd.

From Street: Wings Way.

To Street: Palm Avenue/ U P R R Crossing.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $262,825.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 525.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Auburn Blvd.

From Street: Sierra Vista M H P.

To Street: Sierra Vista M H P.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $13,915.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 642.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 34th Avenue.

From Street: Gaddi Drive.

To Street: 42nd Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $27,080.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 647.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 42nd Street.

From Street: Iowa Avenue.

To Street: 34th Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $13,520.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 649.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 43rd Avenue.

From Street: 40th Street.

To Street: 41st Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $42,725.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 652.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: A Pkwy.

From Street: Center Pkwy.

To Street: East Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $63,870.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 701.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Hemlock Street.

From Street: Palm Avenue.

To Street: Garfield Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $146,480.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 720.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Leader Avenue.

From Street: Pioneer Way.

To Street: Hemlock Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $43,350.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 745.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Orange Avenue.

From Street: Circle Pkwy.

To Street: Persimmon Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $43,110.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 753.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Pioneer Way.

From Street: Leader Avenue.

To Street: Verner Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.21.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $61,605.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 754.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Pomegranate Avenue.

From Street: Saint Lukes Way.

To Street: Persimmon Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $31,950.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 808.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Arden Way.

From Street: Ethan Way.

To Street: Alta Arden Expressway.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.08.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 2.45.

Cost Estimate: $173,970.

Rank: 328.

Project ID: 504.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Ridgepoint Drive.

From Street: Great Valley Drive.

To Street: Antelope North Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.48.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $356,980.

Rank: 347.

Project ID: 617.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Woodring Drive.

From Street: Excelsior Road.

To Street: Zinfandel Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.53.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $1,131,170.

Rank: 347.

Project ID: 724.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Magnolia Avenue.

From Street: New York Avenue.

To Street: Pennsylvania Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $74,075.

Rank: 347.

Project ID: 798.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Wilhaggin Drive.

From Street: Crondall Drive.

To Street: American River Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.4.

Cost Estimate: $20,240.

Rank: 347.

Project ID: 11.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Jackson Road.

From Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

To Street: South Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.19.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $6,865,485.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 104.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Kammerer Bikeway.

From Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

To Street: I 5 NORTH BOUND.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.45.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $10,552,155.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 136.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Pershing Avenue Trail.

From Street: American River Bike Trail.

To Street: Twin Lakes Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $976,525.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 164.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

From Street: I 80 East Bound.

To Street: Bayou Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.63.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $7,579,615.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 342.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Gold River Road.

From Street: Coloma Road.

To Street: Pyrites Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.46.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $341,550.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 359.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hickory Avenue.

From Street: Oak Avenue.

To Street: Indian Hill Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.52.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $381,360.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 396.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Rosemont Drive.

To Street: Thornhill Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 2.35.
Cost Estimate: $142,695.
Rank: 351.

Project ID: 425.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Mayhew Road.
From Street: Folsom Blvd.
To Street: Mayhew Drain Trail.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 2.35.
Cost Estimate: $14,115.
Rank: 351.

Project ID: 458.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Northgate Blvd.
From Street: North Freeway Blvd.
To Street: Del Paso Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.97.
Map Book Grid ID: B3.
Score: 2.35.
Cost Estimate: $716,415.
Rank: 351.

Project ID: 484.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Paseo Rio Way.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: Folsom Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $102,645.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 506.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

From Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

To Street: U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.47.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,087,490.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 616.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Woodmore Oaks Drive.

From Street: Central Avenue.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.71.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $527,305.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 814.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Del Paso Road.

From Street: 450 feet West of Wyndview Drive.

To Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,160,960.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 830.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Freeport Blvd.

From Street: City of Sacramento's South Boundary.

To Street: Freeport Marina.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.81.

Map Book Grid ID: E3.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,670,670.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 857.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Sunrise Blvd.

From Street: 950 feet South of Herodian Drive.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $6,679,220.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 867.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Zinfandel Drive.

From Street: Rancho Cordova's Southern Boundary.

To Street: Douglas Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.71.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 2.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,461,310.

Rank: 351.

Project ID: 7.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

From Street: 44th Street.

To Street: Maynard Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $73,965.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 367.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Howe Avenue.

From Street: Marconi Avenue.

To Street: Auburn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $322,670.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 524.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Short Road.

From Street: Crafton Court.

To Street: Calvine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $370,655.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 543.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tacomic Drive.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Hillsdale Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $279,290.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 592.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walerga Road.

From Street: Palm Avenue.

To Street: Hillsdale Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $232,760.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 634.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Osage Avenue.

From Street: South Watt Avenue.

To Street: South Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $2,080.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 672.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Candell Court.

From Street: Underwood Way.

To Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.04.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $12,140.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 728.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Maynard Way.

From Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

To Street: Candell Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.08.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.3.

Cost Estimate: $22,695.

Rank: 367.

Project ID: 57.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Clairidge Way.

From Street: Cowan School Trail.

To Street: Cowan School Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $156,980.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 95.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Hackberry Lane.

From Street: Hackberry Lane.

To Street: Hackberry Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $55,460.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 103.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Jan Drive Trail.

From Street: Ranger Way.

To Street: Salmaan Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $86,055.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 172.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mayhew Road.

From Street: Oxwood Drive.

To Street: Calibra Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $218,130.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 188.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 10th Street.

From Street: East Street.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.72.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $534,440.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 190.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 14th Street.

From Street: I Street.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $84,520.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 252.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: California Avenue.

From Street: Oak Avenue.

To Street: Tarshes Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.39.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $286,225.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 305.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Modena Avenue.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Artesia Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.28.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $945,820.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 331.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Franklin Blvd.

From Street: Fruitridge Road.

To Street: Huss Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $174,620.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 360.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Highland View Court.

From Street: Norris Avenue.

To Street: Norris Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $14,985.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 438.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mona Woods Lane.

From Street: Mission Avenue.

To Street: Mission Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $14,145.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 461.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Oak Avenue.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: California Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.40.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $298,885.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 462.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Oak Lane.

From Street: M Street.

To Street: Curved Bridge Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $108,510.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 465.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Oleander Drive.

From Street: Oleander Drive Connection.

To Street: Saint James Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.17.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $127,120.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 539.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sun Shadows Lane.

From Street: Engle Road.

To Street: Daybreak Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $17,130.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 549.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Treecrest Avenue.

From Street: Mckay Street.

To Street: Tuckeroo Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $39,635.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 578.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West 2nd Street.

From Street: West Ascot Avenue.

To Street: West U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.43.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $1,797,460.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 591.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West U Street.

From Street: U Street.

To Street: West 6th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.62.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $457,890.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 659.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Becerra Way.

From Street: Woodcrest Road.

To Street: Whitney Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $78,345.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 663.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Berrendo Drive.

From Street: La Sierra Drive.

To Street: Chica Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $21,005.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 667.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Bramhall Way.

From Street: Osgood Way.

To Street: Osgood Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.17.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $49,950.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 673.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Cardinal Road.

From Street: Papaya Drive.

To Street: San Juan Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.53.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $154,380.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 680.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Clairidge Way.

From Street: Robertson Avenue.

To Street: Norris Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.40.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $116,470.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 684.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Delano Street.

From Street: Eloise Avenue.

To Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $47,420.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 687.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Eloise Avenue.

From Street: Delano Street.

To Street: West Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $90,275.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 691.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Flagstone Street.

From Street: Palm Avenue.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $65,590.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 696.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Golden Drive.

From Street: Main Avenue.

To Street: Buffalo Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.55.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $160,940.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 702.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Heritage Drive.

From Street: Saint James Drive.

To Street: Rutland Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $71,485.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 705.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Hinsey Way.

From Street: Osgood Way.

To Street: Kaula Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $8,455.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 719.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Las Pasas Way.

From Street: La Sierra Drive.

To Street: Chica Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $19,115.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 725.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Maple Glen Road.

From Street: Arden Way.

To Street: Winding Creek Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $96,410.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 736.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Natoma Avenue.

From Street: Olive Avenue.

To Street: Toyon Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $71,955.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 748.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Papaya Drive.

From Street: Moraga Drive.

To Street: Cardinal Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.61.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $178,265.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 766.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Rustic Road.
From Street: Winding Way.
To Street: Papaya Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 2.25.
Cost Estimate: $53,835.
Rank: 375.

Project ID: 768.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
On Street: Salmon Falls Drive.
From Street: Water Tree Way.
To Street: Tuolumne Drive.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 2.25.
Cost Estimate: $110,980.
Rank: 375.

Project ID: 780.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
On Street: Stansberry Way.
From Street: Rogue River Drive.
To Street: Whitewater Way.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.08.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 2.25.
Cost Estimate: $22,930.
Rank: 375.

Project ID: 784.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Toyon Avenue.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Natoma Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $39,875.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 793.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Waterton Way.

From Street: Twin Falls Drive.

To Street: Salmon Falls Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.42.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $120,985.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 796.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Whitewater Way.

From Street: Rogue River Drive.

To Street: Linda Rio Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $64,615.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 993.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: New Class 1.

From Street: Florin Road West of Excelsior Road.

To Street: Elder Creek Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.25.

Cost Estimate: $2,038,308.

Rank: 375.

Project ID: 154.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Santa Juanita Trail.

From Street: Oak Avenue.

To Street: Placer County Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.98.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.2.

Cost Estimate: $1,611,990.

Rank: 415.

Project ID: 835.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Hazel Avenue.

From Street: Oak Avenue.

To Street: West Ranch Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.15.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.2.

Cost Estimate: $2,377,615.

Rank: 415.

Project ID: 845.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Oak Avenue Pkwy.

From Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

To Street: 580 feet East of Santa Juanita Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: A7.

Score: 2.2.

Cost Estimate: $213,070.

Rank: 415.

Project ID: 638.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Sky Pkwy.

From Street: 1st Pkwy.

To Street: North Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 2.15.

Cost Estimate: $5,665.

Rank: 418.

Project ID: 9.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

From Street: Hedge Avenue.

To Street: Bradshaw Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.78.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $2,916,360.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 26.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Passalis Lane.

From Street: Gerber Road.

To Street: Waterman Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $417,740.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 45.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Ascot Avenue Trail.

From Street: Dry Creek Road.

To Street: 4th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,638,205.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 48.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Bradshaw Road.

From Street: SMUD Driveway.

To Street: Elder Creek Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.63.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $2,674,720.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 79.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Falcon View Trail.

From Street: Shell Beach Drive.

To Street: Falcon View Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $399,240.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 88.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Gerber Creek Trail.

From Street: CCTC Trail.

To Street: Vineyard Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.12.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $3,477,215.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 89.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Gerber Creek Trail.

From Street: Gerber Road.

To Street: Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.17.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,907,765.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 102.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Jackson Road.

From Street: Excelsior Road.

To Street: Eagles Nest Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.10.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $3,435,620.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 135.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Patrol Road.

From Street: 32nd Street.

To Street: Patrol Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.96.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $4,843,875.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 152.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: San Juan Road.

From Street: San Juan Road.

To Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.73.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,188,965.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 165.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Waterman Trail.

From Street: C C T C Trail.

To Street: Waterman Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.20.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,772,780.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 170.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Winona Way/ U P R R Crossing.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Dudley Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $87,440.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 183.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Service Road.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: Industry Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $303,360.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 187.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Poker Lane / Titan Drive Connection.

From Street: Don Julio Blvd.

To Street: Titan Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $103,005.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 194.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 24th Street.

From Street: Patrol Road.

To Street: U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.32.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,711,675.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 312.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elm Avenue.

From Street: Kenneth Avenue.

To Street: Elm Avenue Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.29.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $216,650.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 323.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Excelsior Road.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Calvine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.56.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $3,371,545.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 355.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Happy Lane.

From Street: Old Placerville Road.

To Street: Kiefer Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.20.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $886,140.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 415.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Main Avenue.

From Street: Lake Natoma Drive.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $39,765.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 516.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: San Juan Avenue.

From Street: Alexander Court.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $205,735.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 560.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: U Street.

From Street: West U Street.

To Street: Harvest Falls Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.44.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,805,365.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 608.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Winding Way.

From Street: Auburn Blvd.

To Street: College Oak Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $742,245.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 623.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bradshaw Road.

From Street: Elder Creek Road.

To Street: Calvine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $635,305.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 656.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Aubergine Way.

From Street: Woolwich Way.

To Street: Excelsior Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $214,730.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 715.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: La Tour Drive.

From Street: Don Julio Blvd.

To Street: Antelope Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.66.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $190,390.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 741.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Old Dairy Drive.

From Street: Singing Tree Way.

To Street: Palmerson Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $119,460.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 749.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Pearlstone Drive.

From Street: Palmerson Drive.

To Street: Cook Riolo Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $39,370.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 756.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Primrose Drive.

From Street: Lake Knoll Lane.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $31,675.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 834.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Gerber Road.

From Street: Bradshaw Road.

To Street: Excelsior Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.01.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.1.

Cost Estimate: $4,147,255.

Rank: 419.

Project ID: 66.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Eagles Nest Road.

From Street: Sunrise Blvd.

To Street: Eagles Nest Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $3,623,155.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 78.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Excelsior Road.

From Street: Kiefer Blvd.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.29.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $2,114,985.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 94.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Grant Line-White Rock Trail.

From Street: Mosher Road.

To Street: White Rock Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 18.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $29,800,280.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 109.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Zinfandel Drive.

To Street: Excelsior Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.77.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $2,892,340.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 111.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: L Street Trail.

From Street: L Street.

To Street: L Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $152,425.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 116.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mather South.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

To Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $4,802,585.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 118.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mercantile Drive.

From Street: Salisbury Road.

To Street: Folsom South Canal Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $186,435.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 148.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Routier Trail.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Old Placerville Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $4,491,035.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 150.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Sacramento River Trail.

From Street: River Road.

To Street: Freeport Marina.

Length: (In Miles.) 7.96.

Map Book Grid ID: E3.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $13,035,470.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 160.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Sunrise Boulevard Trail.

From Street: Folsom Blvd.

To Street: Citrus Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $203,135.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 180.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Roadway East of California Circle.

From Street: Folsom Blvd.

To Street: Aerojet Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $736,340.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 211.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Aerojet Road.

From Street: Folsom Blvd.

To Street: Baltimore Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $220,470.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 234.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bayou Way.

From Street: Bayou Road.

To Street: Airport Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.58.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $1,908,010.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 303.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Centro Road.

From Street: West El Camino Avenue.

To Street: San Juan Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $556,070.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 356.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Harrington Way.

From Street: American River Bike Trail.

To Street: American River Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $165,870.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 377.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Jackson Road.

From Street: Eagles Nest Road.

To Street: East County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 13.36.

Map Book Grid ID: D7.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $9,879,145.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 422.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mather Blvd.

From Street: Douglas Road.

To Street: Park Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.98.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $722,365.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 514.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Roseville Road.

From Street: Antelope Road.

To Street: Imran Woods Circle.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.63.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $1,206,325.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 556.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Twin Cities Road.

From Street: Marengo Road.

To Street: East County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 16.31.

Map Book Grid ID: F7.

Score: 2.05.

Cost Estimate: $12,059,950.

Rank: 448.

Project ID: 230.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Auburn Blvd.

From Street: Howe Avenue.

To Street: Bell Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.29.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 2.

Cost Estimate: $215,165.

Rank: 467.

Project ID: 332.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Fruitridge Road.

From Street: South Watt Avenue.

To Street: Mayhew Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.42.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.

Cost Estimate: $1,046,800.

Rank: 467.

Project ID: 495.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Power Inn Road.

From Street: Junipero Street.

To Street: Lorin Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.
Score: 2.
Cost Estimate: $221,460.
Rank: 467.

Project ID: 614.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Winters Street.
From Street: Downar Way.
To Street: Dean Street.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.
Map Book Grid ID: B4.
Score: 2.
Cost Estimate: $280,090.
Rank: 467.

Project ID: 827.
Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.
On Street: Florin Road.
From Street: Franklin Blvd.
To Street: Sunrise Blvd.
Length: (In Miles.) 7.41.
Map Book Grid ID: D5.
Score: 2.
Cost Estimate: $24,225,900.
Rank: 467.

Project ID: 991.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pennsylvania Avenue.

From Street: Winding Road.

To Street: Sunrise Hills Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.79.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 2.

Cost Estimate: $584,683.

Rank: 467.

Project ID: 994.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: New Class 1.

From Street: Grant Avenue Trail Near Bar Dun Lane.

To Street: Existing Trails Near Gerber Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 2.

Cost Estimate: $650,985.

Rank: 467.

Project ID: 176.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Tree View Road Extension.

From Street: Future Gerber Road Extension.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.23.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.95.

Cost Estimate: $1,650,295.

Rank: 474.

Project ID: 489.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pershing Avenue.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Walnut Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.95.

Cost Estimate: $35,215.

Rank: 474.

Project ID: 595.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walnut Avenue.

From Street: Blue Oak Drive.

To Street: Pershing Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.17.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.95.

Cost Estimate: $129,300.

Rank: 474.

Project ID: 778.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Skyridge Drive.

From Street: Beauregard Way.

To Street: Pershing Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.95.

Cost Estimate: $13,875.

Rank: 474.

Project ID: 2.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: I-5 Trail Connector To Big Horn Blvd.

From Street: Big Horn Blvd.

To Street: Dwight Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $665,360.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 16.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: C C T C Trail.

From Street: Ketcherside Lane.

To Street: South County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 11.57.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $18,929,930.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 18.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Churchill Downs Park Trail - Laguna Creek Trail Connector.

From Street: Markfield Way.

To Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.43.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $710,120.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 19.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Florencia Lane.

From Street: Leland Avenue.

To Street: Florencia Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $451,900.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 20.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Wolfe Heights Trail.

From Street: Leland Avenue.

To Street: Florencia Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.47.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $764,175.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 21.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Wolfe Heights Trail.

From Street: Florencia Lane.

To Street: Admiral Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.58.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $955,390.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 47.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Borden Road.

From Street: West Lane.

To Street: Herald Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $43,010.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 64.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Dry Creek Trail.

From Street: U Street.

To Street: Gibson Ranch Park Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.88.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $3,075,165.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 65.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: East Levee Road.

From Street: West Elkhorn Blvd.

To Street: Nemdec Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.57.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $5,837,700.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 67.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: El Centro Road.

From Street: South end of street.

To Street: San Juan Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $1,654,875.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 77.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Escobar Way Connector.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: South American River Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $190,295.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 84.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Freeport Blvd.

From Street: Freeport Marina.

To Street: River Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: E3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $255,840.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 85.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Garden Highway Trail.

From Street: I 80 East Bound.

To Street: Garden Hwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 12.80.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $20,943,595.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 87.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Gerber Creek Trail.

From Street: C C T C Trail.

To Street: Proposed trail near rail tracks.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.41.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $2,315,845.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 90.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Gibson Ranch Park Road.

From Street: Gibson Lake.

To Street: Gibson Ranch/ Dry Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $453,405.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 93.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Grant Avenue Trail.

From Street: Autumn Point Lane.

To Street: Grant Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $157,630.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 97.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: I-5 Trail.

From Street: Kausen Drive.

To Street: I 5 NORTH BOUND.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.29.

Map Book Grid ID: E3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $3,744,230.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 100.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Isleton-Stone Lakes Trail.

From Street: Grove Street.

To Street: Sacramento River Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 14.29.

Map Book Grid ID: F3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $23,392,345.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 119.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

From Street: South American River Trail.

To Street: Folsom Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $135,935.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 123.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Nemdec Trail.

From Street: West Elkhorn Blvd.

To Street: West Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.04.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $3,340,685.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 125.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: New Class 1 Connector.

From Street: Dry Creek Trail.

To Street: Harvest Falls Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $490,375.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 131.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Palladay Road.

From Street: El Modena Avenue.

To Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.03.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $3,318,090.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 143.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Q Street Trail.

From Street: West Q Street.

To Street: Nemdec Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $929,145.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 151.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Sailor Bar Trail.

From Street: Sailor Bar Trail.

To Street: Sailor Bar Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.22.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $1,997,210.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 155.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: South American River Trail.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: Escobar Way Connector.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $371,515.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 177.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Grant Line Road.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.19.

Map Book Grid ID: D7.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $2,357,840.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 264.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Chicago Avenue.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Yvonne Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.78.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $574,310.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 289.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dillard Road.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

Length: (In Miles.) 14.34.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $10,596,445.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 339.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Gibson Ranch Park Road.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Gibson Ranch Park Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.13.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $834,520.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 346.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Granite Avenue.

From Street: Oak Avenue.

To Street: Cherry Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $552,965.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 373.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Illinois Avenue.

From Street: 1400 Feet South of Curragh Downs Drive.

To Street: Pershing Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $1,596,500.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 394.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Bradshaw Road.

To Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.68.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $1,240,245.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 419.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Marshall Avenue.

From Street: Stanley Avenue.

To Street: Grant Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $369,615.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 453.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Newbury Way.

From Street: Shelfield Drive.

To Street: Claremont Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $52,620.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 491.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Phoenix Avenue.

From Street: Kenneth Avenue.

To Street: Illinois Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $370,000.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 509.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: River Road.

From Street: 2nd St .

To Street: Race Track Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 12.30.

Map Book Grid ID: G2.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $9,095,715.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 538.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sue Pam Drive.

From Street: Whitney Avenue.

To Street: Grant Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $91,160.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 587.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West Elverta Road.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: East Levee Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.31.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $968,505.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 605.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Wildridge Drive.

From Street: Primrose Drive.

To Street: Rimwood Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.43.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $318,685.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 609.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Winding Way.

From Street: Pennsylvania Avenue.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $184,500.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 676.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Cherry Brook Drive.

From Street: Colonnade Way.

To Street: Rushing River Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $39,285.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 681.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Colonnade Way.

From Street: Ranch River Drive.

To Street: Cherry Brook Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $76,265.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 689.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Estates Drive.

From Street: Crondall Drive.

To Street: Crondall Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $7,695.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 693.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Gary Way.

From Street: Mcclaren Drive.

To Street: Arden Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $174,375.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 700.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Harvest Falls Drive.

From Street: Trading Post Court.

To Street: Ranch River Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.06.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $17,860.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 710.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Jacob Lane.

From Street: Dovercourt Circle.

To Street: American River Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $80,530.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 733.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

From Street: Folsom Blvd.

To Street: Escobar Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $324,155.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 758.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Ranch River Drive.

From Street: Colonnade Way.

To Street: Harvest Falls Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $19,905.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 759.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Rimwood Drive.

From Street: Westcamp Road.

To Street: Madison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $164,485.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 760.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: River Oak Way.

From Street: Classic Place.

To Street: Sarah Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $92,740.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 773.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Sand Bar Circle.

From Street: River Walk Way.

To Street: American River Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $33,650.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 775.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Sarah Court.

From Street: Boyer Drive.

To Street: River Oak Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.20.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $57,055.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 776.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Shelfield Drive.

From Street: Carmelo Drive.

To Street: Newbury Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $63,730.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 788.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: San Lorenzo Way.

From Street: Tarshes Drive.

To Street: San Lorenzo Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $76,730.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 789.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Olive Avenue.

From Street: Olive Avenue.

To Street: Sailor Bar Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.9.

Cost Estimate: $31,390.

Rank: 478.

Project ID: 3.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Excelsior Road.

From Street: Gerber Road.

To Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.78.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,278,905.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 28.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elder Creek Trail Connection.

From Street: Mccoy Avenue.

To Street: Elder Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $519,520.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 29.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Goldern State Way Extension.

From Street: Mccoy Avenue.

To Street: Elder Creek Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.53.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,508,435.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 30.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Gardner Avenue.

From Street: Florin Road.

To Street: Elder Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.88.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,440,065.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 32.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Bradshaw Road.

From Street: Teichert Conveyor Trail.

To Street: Bradshaw Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.74.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,219,385.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 106.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mayhew Road.

From Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

To Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $31,835.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 107.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

To Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.00.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $420.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 108.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Morrison Creek Trail.

To Street: Fruitridge Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.34.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $559,195.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 133.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Palm Avenue/ U P R R Crossing.

From Street: Poplar Blvd.

To Street: Roseville Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $156,245.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 134.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Patrol Road.

From Street: Patrol Road.

To Street: Dean Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.84.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $3,011,715.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 162.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Track Crossing Trail.

From Street: Roseville Road.

To Street: AE Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $174,225.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 175.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Gerber Road Extension.

From Street: Excelsior Road.

To Street: Eagles Nest Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.00.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,481,260.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 178.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Waterman Road Extension.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Gerber Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.62.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,673,870.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 181.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Industry Drive.

From Street: Orange Grove Avenue.

To Street: Service Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $72,090.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 197.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 34th Street.

From Street: Dudley Blvd.

To Street: U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.10.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,552,910.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 285.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dean Street.

From Street: Urbani Way.

To Street: Winters Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $194,130.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 352.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Guthrie Street.

From Street: Keema Avenue.

To Street: Don Julio Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $209,185.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 357.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hedge Avenue.

From Street: Elder Creek Road.

To Street: Florin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $741,045.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 374.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Industry Drive.

From Street: I 80 West Bound.

To Street: Orange Grove Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $63,545.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 410.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Longdale Drive.

From Street: Walerga Road.

To Street: Keema Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.55.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $403,580.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 417.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Marconi Avenue.

From Street: Bus 80 East Bound.

To Street: Howe Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $191,770.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 485.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Patrol Road.

From Street: Dean Street.

To Street: 28th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.81.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,335,220.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 502.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Recreation Way.

From Street: Patrol Road.

To Street: 32nd Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $11,950.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 563.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kilzer Street.

From Street: A K Street.

To Street: Mckinney Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $138,360.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 566.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: AE Street.

From Street: Track Crossing Trail.

To Street: Dudley Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $51,785.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 576.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Vineyard Road.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Gerber Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.90.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,146,280.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 639.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 20th Avenue.

From Street: 42nd Street.

To Street: 44th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $36,370.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 641.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 26th Avenue.

From Street: 42nd Street.

To Street: 44th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $20,940.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 644.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 35th Avenue.

From Street: Mendocino Blvd.

To Street: Mendocino Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $7,355.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 648.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: 42nd Street.

From Street: 20th Avenue.

To Street: 26th Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.42.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $122,155.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 654.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Arutas Drive.

From Street: Galbrath Drive.

To Street: Bainbridge Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $71,920.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 730.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Mendocino Blvd.

From Street: 35th Avenue.

To Street: 35th Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $5,995.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 783.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Sunrise Greens Drive.

From Street: Elsie Avenue.

To Street: Summer Sky Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D4.

Score: 1.85.

Cost Estimate: $117,175.

Rank: 533.

Project ID: 15.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Grant Line Road.

From Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

To Street: Mosher Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.23.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $2,005,345.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 73.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elk Grove U P R R Trail.

From Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

To Street: Elk Grove Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.57.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $4,210,770.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 271.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Coloma Road.

From Street: Citrus Road.

To Street: Gold Country Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.03.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $763,785.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 293.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Douglas Road Extension.

From Street: Mather Blvd.

To Street: Park Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.63.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $469,240.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 325.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

From Street: Woodmore Oaks Drive.

To Street: Stacey Hills Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.08.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $56,800.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 389.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kenneth Avenue.

From Street: Central Avenue.

To Street: Elm Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $371,440.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 392.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Eagles Nest Road.

To Street: Sunrise Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $756,910.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 400.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: La Riviera Drive.

From Street: Watt Avenue.

To Street: Watt Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $12,570.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 454.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Nimbus Road.

From Street: Folsom Blvd.

To Street: Albany Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $495,645.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 479.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palmerson Drive.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Shandwick Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $235,075.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 498.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Q Street.

From Street: 16th Street.

To Street: 18th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.43.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $317,075.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 551.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tributary Point Drive.

From Street: Tributary Crossing Drive.

To Street: Hazel Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $301,680.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 621.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dwight Road.

From Street: End of Street at Railroad Tracks.

To Street: Franklin Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $95,155.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 660.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Bell Avenue.

From Street: Dayton Street.

To Street: Winters Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $127,825.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 846.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Old Auburn Road.

From Street: Wachtel Way.

To Street: Northern County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.8.

Cost Estimate: $619,215.

Rank: 566.

Project ID: 42.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Arden Way Connector.

From Street: American River Bike Trail.

To Street: Arden Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $250,210.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 99.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: I-5 Trail Connector.

From Street: I-5 Trail.

To Street: Freeport Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.39.

Map Book Grid ID: E3.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $639,760.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 246.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bruceville Road.

From Street: Bilby Road.

To Street: Lambert Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.02.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $2,967,960.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 328.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Folsom Blvd.

From Street: Hazel Avenue.

To Street: Future road east of California Circle.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.15.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $853,075.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 329.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Folsom Blvd.

From Street: Future road east of California Circle.

To Street: US 50 East Bound.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $85,310.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 350.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Grant Line Road.

From Street: White Rock Road.

To Street: Waterman Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 17.95.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $13,265,620.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 384.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kammerer Road.

From Street: Lent Ranch Pkwy.

To Street: Promenade Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $267,590.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 619.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Zinfandel Drive.

From Street: Douglas Road.

To Street: Kiefer Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.18.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $1,614,805.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 626.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elk Grove Blvd.

From Street: I 5 SOUTH BOUND.

To Street: Franklin Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.07.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $328,040.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 633.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kammerer Road.

From Street: Bruceville Road.

To Street: Lent Ranch Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.49.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 1.75.

Cost Estimate: $393,670.

Rank: 581.

Project ID: 13.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Windsor Village Lane.

From Street: Pennsylvania Avenue.

To Street: Sunrise Hills Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $29,060.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 14.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Westcamp Road.

From Street: Rimwood Drive.

To Street: Westcamp Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $30,260.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 22.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Wolfe Heights Trail Connector.

From Street: Wolfe Heights Trail.

To Street: Passalis Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $303,815.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 25.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Wolfe Heights Trail Connector Spur.

From Street: Passalis Lane Extension.

To Street: Wolfe Heights Trail Connector.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.04.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $57,610.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 44.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Ascot Avenue Connector.

From Street: West 6th Street.

To Street: East Levee Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $246,280.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 75.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elm Avenue.

From Street: Elm Avenue Trail.

To Street: Elm Avenue Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $122,140.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 101.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Jackson Road.

From Street: Eagles Nest Road.

To Street: Sunrise Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $1,663,945.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 122.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Nemdec Trail.

From Street: Ascot Avenue Connector.

To Street: West Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $2,039,130.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 146.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Radio Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

To Street: Witter Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.63.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $1,037,900.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 173.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Oates Drive/ Butterfield Way Connection.

From Street: Oates Drive.

To Street: Butterfield Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $163,220.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 174.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Waterman Road Extension.

From Street: Gerber Creek Trail.

To Street: Waterman Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $109,135.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 186.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West U Street.

From Street: West Delano Street.

To Street: West U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $243,340.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 205.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 9th Street.

From Street: U Street.

To Street: Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.66.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $485,780.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 207.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Adair Street.

From Street: El Modena Avenue.

To Street: Elwyn Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $371,080.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 225.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Artesia Road.

From Street: Elwyn Avenue.

To Street: El Modena Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $361,935.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 227.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Ascot Avenue.

From Street: West 2nd Street.

To Street: 4th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $373,390.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 242.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Allegheny Drive.

From Street: Hyannis Way.

To Street: Hyannis Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $9,495.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 249.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

To Street: San Juan Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.73.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $538,460.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 257.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Carey Road.

From Street: Del Paso Road.

To Street: Sotnip Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $13,805.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 258.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cavallo Real Way.

From Street: Mustang Way.

To Street: Winding Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $7,850.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 278.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cozzins Court.

From Street: Smith Farm Court.

To Street: Yvonne Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $17,675.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 292.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dory Way.

From Street: Greenridge Way.

To Street: Lake Knoll Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $263,740.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 298.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: East Street.

From Street: 10th Street.

To Street: 24th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.73.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $1,275,940.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 306.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Rio Avenue.

From Street: West Elverta Road.

To Street: West Delano Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $227,750.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 307.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Verano Avenue.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Antelope Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.98.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $726,910.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 314.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Elverta Road.
From Street: Antelope Road.
To Street: Sassafras Way.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.15.
Map Book Grid ID: A5.
Score: 1.65.
Cost Estimate: $112,320.
Rank: 591.

Project ID: 333.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Fulton Avenue.
From Street: Auburn Blvd.
To Street: Auburn Blvd.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.
Map Book Grid ID: B4.
Score: 1.65.
Cost Estimate: $12,870.
Rank: 591.

Project ID: 347.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Grant Avenue.
From Street: Grant Avenue Trail.
To Street: Hollister Avenue.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.63.
Map Book Grid ID: B5.
Score: 1.65.
Cost Estimate: $463,535.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 366.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Folsom Blvd.

From Street: Paseo Rio Way.

To Street: Paseo Rio Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $11,745.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 412.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Los Rios Drive.

From Street: Mcclaren Drive.

To Street: Shelato Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.06.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $44,840.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 421.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Marysville Blvd.

From Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

To Street: Straugh Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.19.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $1,617,720.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 426.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mcclaren Drive.

From Street: Sand Bar Circle.

To Street: Shelato Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $239,130.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 435.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Minnesota Avenue.

From Street: Winding Way.

To Street: Sunset Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.56.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $411,105.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 436.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Mission Avenue.
From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.
To Street: Arden Way.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.58.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 1.65.
Cost Estimate: $425,590.
Rank: 591.

Project ID: 460.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Nott Lane.
From Street: Roca Way.
To Street: Antelope Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.
Map Book Grid ID: A5.
Score: 1.65.
Cost Estimate: $10,400.
Rank: 591.

Project ID: 463.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Oates Drive.
From Street: End of Oates Drive.
To Street: Bradshaw Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.20.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 1.65.
Cost Estimate: $144,365.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 464.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Old Ranch Road.

From Street: Cranford Way.

To Street: Kenneth Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $322,635.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 481.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palmyra Drive.

From Street: Madison Avenue.

To Street: Dory Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.34.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $252,245.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 501.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Radio Road.

From Street: El Centro Road.

To Street: Garden Hwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $868,650.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 522.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Shelato Way.

From Street: Los Rios Drive.

To Street: Mcclaren Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $373,765.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 547.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Titan Drive.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Turbine Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $265,335.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 581.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West Ascot Avenue.

From Street: West 2nd Street.

To Street: West 6th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $363,480.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 597.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walnut Grove Bridge.

From Street: Highway 160.

To Street: River Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: H3.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $64,540.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 611.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Winding Way.

From Street: Olivegate Drive.

To Street: Isabella Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.00.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $3,495.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 653.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Appalachian Drive.

From Street: Escobar Way.

To Street: Hyannis Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $13,340.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 666.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Boyer Drive.

From Street: Sarah Court.

To Street: Oak Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $25,690.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 669.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Buffalo Avenue.

From Street: Main Avenue.

To Street: Mississippi Bar Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $126,715.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 670.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Butterfield Way.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: Stoughton Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $75,390.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 682.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Cook Riolo Road.

From Street: Pearlstone Drive.

To Street: Great Valley Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $40,820.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 683.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Crondall Drive.

From Street: Wilhaggin Drive.

To Street: Estates Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $87,425.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 685.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Dredger Way.

From Street: Main Avenue.

To Street: Buffalo Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $149,260.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 688.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Escobar Way.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: Appalachian Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $79,690.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 697.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Great Valley Drive.

From Street: Cook Riolo Road.

To Street: Antelope North Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.52.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $150,820.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 698.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Greenridge Way.

From Street: Minnesota Avenue.

To Street: Dory Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $62,800.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 706.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Hyannis Way.

From Street: Appalachian Drive.

To Street: Bradshaw Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.04.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $12,650.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 716.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Primrose Drive.

From Street: Lake Knoll Lane.

To Street: Lake Knoll Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $74,920.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 732.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Minnesota Avenue.

From Street: Sunset Avenue.

To Street: Greenridge Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $65,660.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 738.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: New York Avenue.

From Street: Magnolia Avenue.

To Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $54,205.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 740.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Northam Drive.

From Street: Elverta Road.

To Street: Redwater Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.56.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $161,600.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 744.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Olive Avenue.

From Street: Natoma Avenue.

To Street: Olive Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.04.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $12,355.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 755.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Primrose Drive.

From Street: Lake Knoll Lane.

To Street: Wildridge Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.04.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $12,540

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 761.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: River Walk Way.

From Street: Sand Bar Circle.

To Street: Sand Bar Circle.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $8,420.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 770.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: San Lorenzo Way.

From Street: San Lorenzo Way.

To Street: Palm Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $32,115.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 771.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: San Ramon Way.

From Street: Fair Oaks Blvd.

To Street: La Sierra Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.39.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $114,065.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 781.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Stoughton Way.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: Butterfield Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.65.

Cost Estimate: $119,840.

Rank: 591.

Project ID: 24.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Rogers Road.

From Street: Admiral Lane.

To Street: Admiral Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.00.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $255.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 36.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Alder Creek Trail.

From Street: Aerojet Road.

To Street: Future road east of California Circle.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.43.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $2,347,990.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 49.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Private road.

To Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.52.

Map Book Grid ID: C3.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $852,525.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 53.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Calvine Road.

From Street: Bader Road.

To Street: Grant Line Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.63.

Map Book Grid ID: E5.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $4,299,190.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 58.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Curragh Downs Trail.

From Street: Curragh Downs Drive.

To Street: Illinois Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $83,880.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 91.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Golden Gate Avenue.

From Street: Granite Avenue.

To Street: Golden Gate Avenue Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $203,975.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 92.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Granite Avenue Trail.

From Street: Cherry Avenue.

To Street: Placer County Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.46.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $758,030.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 98.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: I-5 Trail Connector.

From Street: Dwight Road.

To Street: I-5 Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.08.

Map Book Grid ID: E4.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $1,763,930.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 126.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Nimbus Road.

From Street: Albany Avenue.

To Street: Alder Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $988,060.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 137.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Phoenix Park Trail.

From Street: Groff Drive.

To Street: Sunset Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $608,755.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 139.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Placer County Trail.

From Street: Santa Juanita Trail.

To Street: WPA Powerline Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.65.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $4,339,300.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 141.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Placerville Road Trail.

From Street: White Rock Road.

To Street: US 50 East Bound.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.55.

Map Book Grid ID: B8.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $4,931,370.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 145.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Quiggle Road.

From Street: West Lane.

To Street: Herald Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $43,070.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 159.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Stone Lakes Refuge Trail.

From Street: Sacramento River Trail.

To Street: I 5 NORTH BOUND.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.92.

Map Book Grid ID: E3.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $3,148,160.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 168.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: White Rock Road.

From Street: Rancho Cordova City Limit.

To Street: Grant Line Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.68.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $6,022,150.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 179.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Kenosha Road Extension.

From Street: Kenosha Road.

To Street: White Rock Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.58.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $1,168,325.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 209.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Future Waterman Road Extension.

From Street: Gerber Creek Trail.

To Street: Gerber Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.35.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $259,800.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 210.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Aerojet Road.

From Street: Aerojet Road.

To Street: Louisiana Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.72.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $532,920.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 212.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bayou Way.

From Street: Airport Blvd.

To Street: Airport Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.06.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $46,140.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 256.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cardwell Avenue.

From Street: Oak Avenue.

To Street: Golden Gate Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $368,290.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 259.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: C C T C Trail.

From Street: Rancheria Drive.

To Street: Green Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $4,455.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 262.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cherry Avenue.

From Street: Hazel Avenue.

To Street: Mountain Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.27.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $935,530.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 282.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Curragh Downs Drive.

From Street: Curragh Downs Trail.

To Street: Hazel Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $368,960.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 287.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Del Paso Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

To Street: Power Line Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.86.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $638,015.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 310.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elkhorn Blvd Extension.

From Street: Power Line Road.

To Street: Airport Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $753,605.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 343.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Golden Gate Avenue.

From Street: Granite Avenue.

To Street: Cardwell Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.80.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $588,015.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 344.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Golden Gate Avenue.

From Street: Hazel Avenue.

To Street: Golden Gate Avenue Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.64.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $469,840.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 390.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kenosha Road.

From Street: Albany Avenue.

To Street: Louisiana Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.58.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $431,485.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 397.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kost Road.

From Street: Orr Road.

To Street: Tudor Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.22.

Map Book Grid ID: H5.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $2,380,685.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 409.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Lone Tree Road.

From Street: Meister Way.

To Street: West Elverta Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 2.50.
Map Book Grid ID: A3.
Score: 1.6.
Cost Estimate: $1,849,425.
Rank: 656.

Project ID: 445.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Mountain Avenue.
From Street: Oak Avenue.
To Street: Cherry Avenue.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.
Map Book Grid ID: A6.
Score: 1.6.
Cost Estimate: $552,810.
Rank: 656.

Project ID: 448.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: North Bayou Way.
From Street: Airport Blvd.
To Street: Garden Hwy.
Length: (In Miles.) 1.90.
Map Book Grid ID: B2.
Score: 1.6.
Cost Estimate: $1,404,025.
Rank: 656.

Project ID: 452.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: New Hope Road.

From Street: Orr Road.

To Street: Turnace Court.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.72.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $2,013,230.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 468.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Orr Road.

From Street: New Hope Road.

To Street: Sparrow Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.93.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $2,907,170.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 490.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Phoenix Avenue.

From Street: Illinois Avenue.

To Street: Runway Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.89.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $657,075.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 519.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Santa Juanita Avenue.

From Street: Dowd Court.

To Street: Barten Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.97.

Map Book Grid ID: A7.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $714,015.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 529.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sloughhouse Road.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Grant Line Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.30.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $3,180,280.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 561.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Birkmont Drive.

From Street: Aerojet Road.

To Street: Aerojet Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.
Map Book Grid ID: B6.
Score: 1.6.
Cost Estimate: $12,860.
Rank: 656.

Project ID: 601.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Welch Road.
From Street: Alta Mesa Road.
To Street: Pond Lane.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.
Map Book Grid ID: E6.
Score: 1.6.
Cost Estimate: $9,760.
Rank: 656.

Project ID: 729.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.
On Street: Mcclaren Drive.
From Street: Shelato Way.
To Street: Arden Way.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.
Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 1.6.
Cost Estimate: $105,145.
Rank: 656.

Project ID: 731.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Mills Road.

From Street: Huntington Road.

To Street: Drake Circle.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $64,440.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 848.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Prairie City Road.

From Street: US 50 East Bound.

To Street: White Rock Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.95.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $4,006,615.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 861.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: West Elverta Road.

From Street: East Levee Road.

To Street: Hwy 99 South bound Ramps.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.02.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $6,224,205.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 37.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Alder Creek Trail.

From Street: Alder Creek Pkwy.

To Street: Prairie City Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.03.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $9,014,440.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 61.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Deer Creek Trail.

From Street: White Rock Road.

To Street: Alder Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.18.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 1.6.

Cost Estimate: $3,976,560.

Rank: 656.

Project ID: 196.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 32nd Street.

From Street: Recreation Way.

To Street: U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.97.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.55.

Cost Estimate: $1,458,175.

Rank: 701.

Project ID: 295.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dudley Blvd.

From Street: AE Street.

To Street: Dudley Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.21.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.55.

Cost Estimate: $153,665.

Rank: 701.

Project ID: 51.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

To Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.23.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $378,405.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 52.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

To Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $806,410.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 349.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Grant Line Road.

From Street: Railroad Overpass.

To Street: Promenade Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.76.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $561,030.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 393.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: West Jackson Highway Master Plan New Class 1.

To Street: Excelsior Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.77.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $567,975.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 550.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tributary Crossing Drive.

From Street: Gold Pointe Lane.

To Street: Tributary Point Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $95,785.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 583.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West El Camino Avenue.

From Street: I 80 East Bound.

To Street: El Centro Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $179,740.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 590.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West Stockton Blvd.

From Street: Kammerer Road.

To Street: Eschinger Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.28.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $947,060.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 606.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Willard Pkwy.

From Street: Bilby Road.

To Street: Bilby Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.07.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $49,100.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 622.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bilby Road.

From Street: Willard Pkwy.

To Street: Bruceville Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.60.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 1.5.

Cost Estimate: $253,060.

Rank: 703.

Project ID: 59.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Deer Creek Trail.

From Street: North of Jackson Road.

To Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.09.

Map Book Grid ID: D8.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $6,697,705.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 60.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Deer Creek Trail.

From Street: White Rock Road.

To Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 5.25.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $8,586,420.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 82.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Folsom South Canal Trail.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: Dillard Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 8.39.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $13,737,315.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 83.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Folsom South Canal Trail.

From Street: Dillard Road.

To Street: Sloughhouse Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.93.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $4,803,450.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 115.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Laguna Creek Trail.

From Street: Deer Creek Trail.

To Street: Eastern County Edge.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C8.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $6,495,440.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 156.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: South American River Trail.

From Street: Escobar Way Connector.

To Street: Escobar Way Connector.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.00.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $4,290.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 158.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: South American River Trail.

From Street: Escobar Way Connector.

To Street: Escobar Way Connector.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.00.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $4,290.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 169.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: White Rock Trail.

From Street: Grant Line-White Rock Trail.

To Street: White Rock Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 5.61.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $9,187,410.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 279.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cresthill Drive.

From Street: Sheldon Lake Drive.

To Street: Sloughhouse Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $476,825.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 430.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mckinley Avenue.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: Clay Station Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.93.

Map Book Grid ID: F7.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $687,275.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 434.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Michigan Bar Road.

From Street: Latrobe Road.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.05.

Map Book Grid ID: D8.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $2,992,240.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 469.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Oxbow Drive.

From Street: Tyler Island Bridge Road.

To Street: Terminous Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.95.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $1,439,225.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 507.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

From Street: West Elverta Road.

To Street: Pleasant Grove Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.04.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $1,510,620.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 523.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sheldon Lake Drive.

From Street: Grant Line Road.

To Street: Cresthill Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.64.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $472,100.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 534.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: State Highway 12.

From Street: Hwy 160.

To Street: Brannan Island Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 5.50.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $4,067,530.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 546.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Terminous Road.

From Street: Jackson Slough Road.

To Street: Oxbow Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $444,645.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 557.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tyler Island Bridge Road.

From Street: Tyler Island Road.

To Street: Hwy 160.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.45.

Cost Estimate: $555,200.

Rank: 712.

Project ID: 694.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Gilman Way.

From Street: Gay Way.

To Street: Kirkby Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.4.

Cost Estimate: $187,570.

Rank: 729.

Project ID: 35.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Aerojet Road.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 2.

To Street: Alder Creek Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $195,875.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 46.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Airport Blvd.

From Street: North Bayou Way.

To Street: Elk Horn Blvd Extension.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $202,375.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 50.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

To Street: Private road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $418,120.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 105.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Kiefer Blvd.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Tree View Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $440,195.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 124.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Nemdec Trail.

From Street: West Elverta Road.

To Street: East Levee Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.52.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $2,486,170.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 127.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Nimbus Road.

From Street: Aerojet Road.

To Street: Nimbus Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.61.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $991,385.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 138.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Phoenix/ Windsock Connector.

From Street: Windsock Avenue.

To Street: Phoenix Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $46,925.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 191.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 16th Street.

From Street: Ascot Avenue.

To Street: Elkhorn Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.33.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $981,035.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 192.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 16th Street.

From Street: Q Street.

To Street: Northern County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.28.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,687,960.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 193.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 20th Street.

From Street: Ascot Avenue.

To Street: Q Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.00.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,478,375.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 208.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Adair Street.

From Street: El Modena Avenue.

To Street: El Verano Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $247,595.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 213.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bayou Way.

From Street: I 5 SOUTH BOUND.

To Street: Airport Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B2.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $88,670.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 218.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: American River Drive.

From Street: Jacob Lane.

To Street: Los Rios Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $281,675.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 220.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Antelope North Road.

From Street: Poker Lane.

To Street: Great Valley Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.09.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $805,195.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 222.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Antelope Road.

From Street: Antelope Road.

To Street: Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $198,815.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 241.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bradshaw Road.

From Street: Hyannis Way.

To Street: Folsom Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $93,210.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 247.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Garden Hwy.

To Street: Private road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: C3.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $183,565.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 248.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

To Street: Private road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: C3.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $375,470.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 250.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bryte Bend Road.

From Street: Private road.

To Street: Upper Westside New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $181,845.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 276.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Country Lake Drive.

From Street: Country Creek Drive.

To Street: Petite Creek Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $91,010.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 277.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Courtland Bridge.

From Street: Hwy 160.

To Street: River Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: G2.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $97,330.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 336.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Garfield Avenue.

From Street: Gibbons Drive.

To Street: Cypress Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $178,980.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 398.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: L Street.

From Street: L Street Trail.

To Street: La Serena Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.05.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $33,340.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 418.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Marengo Road.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: Boessow Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.51.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,853,940.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 432.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Meister Way.

From Street: Lone Tree Road.

To Street: Metro Air Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $369,835.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 433.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Metro Air Pkwy.
From Street: Meister Way.
To Street: Bayou Way.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.
Map Book Grid ID: B2.
Score: 1.35.
Cost Estimate: $371,300.
Rank: 730.

Project ID: 470.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Palladay Road.
From Street: Palladay Road.
To Street: El Verano Avenue.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.42.
Map Book Grid ID: A4.
Score: 1.35.
Cost Estimate: $311,290.
Rank: 730.

Project ID: 471.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Palladay Road.
From Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.
To Street: Palladay Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.
Map Book Grid ID: A4.
Score: 1.35.
Cost Estimate: $178,295.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 499.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Q Street.

From Street: West Q Street.

To Street: 2nd Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.08.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $62,750.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 528.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Skyking Road.

From Street: Power Line Road.

To Street: Metro Air Pkwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: A2.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $280,945.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 555.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Twin Cities Road.

From Street: Mckenzie Road.

To Street: Carillion Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.19.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $138,915.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 562.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Illinois Avenue.

From Street: Sailor Bar Trail.

To Street: Illinois Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $64,770.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 572.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palladay Road Extension.

From Street: Palladay Road.

To Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $100,855.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 577.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Vought Drive.

From Street: Windsock Avenue.

To Street: Flyway Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $66,445.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 584.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West Elkhorn Blvd.

From Street: Golden State Hwy.

To Street: Power Line Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.96.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $1,450,205.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 593.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walerga Road.

From Street: Old Dairy Drive.

To Street: Country Run Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $78,310.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 600.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Waterman Road.

From Street: Dersingham Drive.

To Street: Vintage Park Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.72.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $532,620.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 612.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Windsock Avenue.

From Street: Vought Drive.

To Street: Winding Oak Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $115,310.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 665.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Blackfoot Way.

From Street: Pima Way.

To Street: Navaho Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.11.

Map Book Grid ID: A5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $32,745.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 735.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Mississippi Bar Drive.

From Street: Buffalo Avenue.

To Street: Buffalo Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $6,665.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 797.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Wildhawk West Drive.

From Street: Wingspan Drive.

To Street: Vineyard Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.70.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $202,915.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 802.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Wingspan Drive.

From Street: Vineyard Road.

To Street: Wildhawk West Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $129,000.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 868.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Off-Street.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: Rancho Cordova Class 1.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.

Score: 1.35.

Cost Estimate: $56,890.

Rank: 730.

Project ID: 401.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: La Serena Drive.

From Street: Hazel Avenue.

To Street: L Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.59.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.3.

Cost Estimate: $432,705.

Rank: 773.

Project ID: 586.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West Elverta Road.

From Street: Golden State Hwy.

To Street: Garden Hwy.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.43.

Map Book Grid ID: A2.

Score: 1.3.

Cost Estimate: $2,532,470.

Rank: 773.

Project ID: 1.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Trail To Rancho Seco Park.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: Rancho Seco Park.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.23.

Map Book Grid ID: F8.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $2,013,785.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 23.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Rogers Road Utility Corridor.

From Street: Wolfe Heights Trail.

To Street: Heathfield Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.96.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $1,564,845.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 72.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Hwy 99 NORTH BOUND.

From Street: Elk Grove U P R R Trail.

To Street: Elk Grove U P R R Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $673,280.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 120.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mokelumne River Trail.

From Street: Bean Ranch Road.

To Street: Levee Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.42.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $679,750.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 195.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: River Road.

From Street: Hood Franklin Road.

To Street: 2nd Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: F3.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $69,950.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 229.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Auburn Blvd.

From Street: Marconi Avenue.

To Street: Edison Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $13,725.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 244.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Brannan Island Road.

From Street: West Brannan Island Road.

To Street: State Highway 12.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.51.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $1,851,830.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 288.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Franklin Blvd.

From Street: Desmond Road.

To Street: Desmond Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.01.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $10,770.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 316.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elwyn Avenue.

From Street: West U Street.

To Street: West Elverta Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $477,025.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 372.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: I Street.

From Street: 14th Street.

To Street: 24th Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.25.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $924,825.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 379.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Jackson Slough Road.

From Street: Terminous Road.

To Street: Brannan Island Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.54.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $1,880,430.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 391.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Brannan Island Road.

From Street: State Highway 12.

To Street: Kettleman Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $103,600.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 472.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Simmerhorn Road.

From Street: Palm Avenue.

To Street: Palm Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $25,310.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 582.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West Brannan Island Road.

From Street: Brannan Island Road.

To Street: Brannan Island Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.96.

Map Book Grid ID: I2.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $2,927,170.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 588.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West M Street.

From Street: M Street.

To Street: Marysville Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.48.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 1.2.

Cost Estimate: $356,605.

Rank: 775.

Project ID: 237.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Boessow Road.

From Street: Marengo Road.

To Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.04.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $2,245,815.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 238.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Borden Road.

From Street: Herald Road.

To Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.98.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $723,780.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 272.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Colony Road.

From Street: Dillard Road.

To Street: Valensin Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.01.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $4,444,335.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 321.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Ethan Way.

From Street: Hurley Way.

To Street: Hurley Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.08.

Map Book Grid ID: C4.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $55,875.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 330.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Franklin Blvd.

From Street: Willard Pkwy.

To Street: Twin Cities Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 7.09.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $5,241,350.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 365.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hood Franklin Road.

From Street: 2nd Street.

To Street: Franklin Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.72.

Map Book Grid ID: F3.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $2,748,845.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 371.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hwy 160.

From Street: Sutter Slough Bridge Road.

To Street: Walnut Grove Bridge.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.73.

Map Book Grid ID: G3.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $4,976,055.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 526.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Simmerhorn Road.

From Street: Palm Avenue.

To Street: Clay Station Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.76.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $4,996,200.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 554.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Twin Cities Road.

From Street: River Road.

To Street: West Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 12.28.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $9,077,305.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 603.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: White Rock Road.

From Street: Grant Line Road.

To Street: White Rock Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.38.

Map Book Grid ID: B7.

Score: 1.15.

Cost Estimate: $4,714,910.

Rank: 790.

Project ID: 226.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Ascot Avenue.

From Street: Dry Creek Road.

To Street: Patrol Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.24.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.1.

Cost Estimate: $916,220.

Rank: 800.

Project ID: 297.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dudley Way.

From Street: Dudley Blvd.

To Street: Bailey Loop.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 1.1.

Cost Estimate: $87,580.

Rank: 800.

Project ID: 299.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Eagles Nest Road.

From Street: Kiefer Blvd.

To Street: Grant Line Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.05.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 1.1.

Cost Estimate: $2,992,150.

Rank: 800.

Project ID: 423.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mayhew Road.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Elder Creek Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.42.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 1.1.

Cost Estimate: $1,051,860.

Rank: 800.

Project ID: 414.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Main Avenue.

From Street: Sunset Avenue.

To Street: Winding Oak Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.42.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 1.05.

Cost Estimate: $312,375.

Rank: 804.

Project ID: 992.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Walnut Grove To Isleton Abandon Rail.

From Street: Jackson Slough Road.

To Street: C Street Walnut Grove.

Length: (In Miles.) 9.10.

Map Book Grid ID: H3.

Score: 1.

Cost Estimate: $14,899,453.

Rank: 805.

Project ID: 201.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 4th Street.

From Street: Ascot Avenue.

To Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.35.

Map Book Grid ID: B4.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $262,220.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 239.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Borden Road.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: West Lane.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.34.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $253,565.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 243.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bradshaw Road.

From Street: Mira Del Rio Drive.

To Street: Hyannis Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: C5.
Score: 0.9.
Cost Estimate: $224,595.
Rank: 806.

Project ID: 317.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Elwyn Avenue.
From Street: Rio Linda Blvd.
To Street: Locust Road.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.90.
Map Book Grid ID: A4.
Score: 0.9.
Cost Estimate: $662,805.
Rank: 806.

Project ID: 395.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Kiefer Blvd.
From Street: Folsom Blvd.
To Street: Reith Court.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.
Map Book Grid ID: C4.
Score: 0.9.
Cost Estimate: $300,120.
Rank: 806.

Project ID: 424.
Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mayhew Road.

From Street: 2220 Feet North of Jackson Road.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: D5.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $242,460.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 429.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mckenzie Road.

From Street: Arno Road.

To Street: Twin Cities Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.38.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $1,760,735.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 467.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Orangevale Avenue.

From Street: Main Avenue.

To Street: Placer Mine Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $183,880.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 579.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West 6th Street.

From Street: West Ascot Avenue.

To Street: Marysville Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.85.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $1,366,465.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 580.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West 6th Street.

From Street: Straugh Road.

To Street: West U Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.36.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $267,260.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 589.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: West Q Street.

From Street: Q Street.

To Street: Q Street Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.64.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Score: 0.9.

Cost Estimate: $473,130.

Rank: 806.

Project ID: 216.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Alta Mesa Road.

From Street: Dillard Road.

To Street: Boessow Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 11.74.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $8,677,730.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 217.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Amalgam Way.

From Street: Gold River Road.

To Street: Pyrites Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.47.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $349,625.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 240.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Borden Road.

From Street: Alta Mesa Road.

To Street: Clay Station Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.00.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,215,285.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 261.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cherokee Lane.

From Street: Conley Road.

To Street: Boessow Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.30.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,435,685.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 273.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Conley Road.

From Street: Cherokee Lane.

To Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.06.

Map Book Grid ID: G6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,522,240.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 274.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Core Road.

From Street: Franklin Blvd.

To Street: Ed Rau Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.88.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $650,730.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 275.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Country Creek Drive.

From Street: Country Trail Drive.

To Street: Country Lake Drive.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: A6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $232,195.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 301.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Ed Rau Road.

From Street: Core Road.

To Street: Eschinger Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $362,760.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 309.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elk Grove Blvd.

From Street: I 5 SOUTH BOUND.

To Street: I 5 SOUTH BOUND.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.00.

Map Book Grid ID: E3.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,870.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 320.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Eschinger Road.

From Street: Ed Rau Road.

To Street: West Stockton Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 5.45.

Map Book Grid ID: F4.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $4,025,215.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 351.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Green Road.

From Street: Wilton Road.

To Street: Dillard Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.55.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,884,585.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 403.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Lambert Road.

From Street: River Road.

To Street: Bruceville Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 7.86.

Map Book Grid ID: F3.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $5,809,440.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 405.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Latrobe Road.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Michigan Bar Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 7.26.

Map Book Grid ID: D8.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $5,366,470.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 497.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Pyrites Way.

From Street: Gold River Road.

To Street: Amalgam Way.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.52.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $387,240.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 500.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Race Track Road.

From Street: Walnut Grove Thornton Road.

To Street: Tyler Island Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.39.

Map Book Grid ID: H3.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $1,768,390.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 508.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Rising Road.

From Street: Alta Mesa Road.

To Street: Tavernor Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.50.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $369,640.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 573.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Valensin Road.

From Street: Colony Road.

To Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.86.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $635,235.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 594.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walmort Road.

From Street: Dillard Road.

To Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.71.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,740,110.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 599.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walnut Grove Thornton Road.

From Street: Race Track Road.

To Street: Walnut Grove Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.98.

Map Book Grid ID: H3.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $726,125.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 607.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Wilton Road.

From Street: Grant Line Road.

To Street: Dillard Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.13.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Score: 0.85.

Cost Estimate: $2,310,300.

Rank: 817.

Project ID: 223.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Arno Road.

From Street: Valensin Ranch Road.

To Street: Riley Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.25.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,665,130.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 245.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Bruceville Road.

From Street: Lambert Road.

To Street: Twin Cities Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.12.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,570,710.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 265.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Christensen Road.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: New Hope Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.01.

Map Book Grid ID: G5.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $2,225,000.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 266.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Clay Station Road.

From Street: Borden Road.

To Street: Simmerhorn Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.00.

Map Book Grid ID: G7.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,476,590.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 267.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Clay Station Road.

From Street: Mckinley Avenue.

To Street: Borden Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.14.

Map Book Grid ID: G7.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,583,505.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 268.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Clay Station Road.

From Street: Dillard Road.

To Street: Twin Cities Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 7.37.

Map Book Grid ID: F7.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $5,448,000.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 363.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hobday Road.

From Street: Colony Road.

To Street: Folsom South Canal Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.87.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $2,121,205.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 370.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Hwy 160.

From Street: State Highway 12.

To Street: Sherman Island East Levee Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 10.40.

Map Book Grid ID: J1.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $7,685,315.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 451.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: New Hope Road.

From Street: North New Hope Road.

To Street: Kost Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.91.

Map Book Grid ID: H4.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $2,151,820.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 521.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Scott Road.

From Street: White Rock Road.

To Street: Latrobe Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 7.92.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $5,850,785.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 537.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Stonehouse Road.

From Street: Latrobe Road.

To Street: Jackson Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.46.

Map Book Grid ID: D8.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,081,040.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 540.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sunrise Blvd.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: Grant Line Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.43.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $1,055,905.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 558.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tyler Island Road.

From Street: Race Track Road.

To Street: Tyler Island Bridge Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.72.

Map Book Grid ID: H3.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $3,490,280.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 574.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Valensin Road.

From Street: Arno Road.

To Street: Colony Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.01.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $2,221,695.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 618.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Woods Road.

From Street: Colony Road.

To Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $735,670.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 628.

Bicycle Class: Buffered Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Franklin Blvd.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: North Thornton Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.45.

Map Book Grid ID: G4.

Score: 0.7.

Cost Estimate: $387,675.

Rank: 837.

Project ID: 236.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Blake Road.

From Street: Colony Road.

To Street: Alta Mesa Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.99.

Map Book Grid ID: F6.

Score: 0.6.

Cost Estimate: $733,020.

Rank: 853.

Project ID: 302.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Centro Road.

From Street: Upper Westside New Class 1.

To Street: West El Camino Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: B3.

Score: 0.6.

Cost Estimate: $204,640.

Rank: 853.

Project ID: 530.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Sorento Road.

From Street: West Elverta Road.

To Street: Rio Linda Blvd.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.25.

Map Book Grid ID: A3.

Score: 0.6.

Cost Estimate: $924,695.

Rank: 853.

Project ID: 545.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Tavernor Road.

From Street: Quince Lane.

To Street: Rising Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 3.80.

Map Book Grid ID: E6.

Score: 0.6.

Cost Estimate: $2,805,285.

Rank: 853.

Project ID: 598.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Walnut Grove Road.

From Street: Walnut Grove Thornton Road.

To Street: West Walnut Grove Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.03.

Map Book Grid ID: H3.

Score: 0.6.

Cost Estimate: $19,655.

Rank: 853.

Project ID: 699.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Groff Drive.

From Street: La Serena Drive.

To Street: Phoenix Park Trail.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.09.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 0.6.

Cost Estimate: $26,215.

Rank: 853.

Project ID: 765.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Boulevard.

On Street: Runway Drive.

From Street: Sunset Avenue.

To Street: Phoenix Avenue.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.54.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Score: 0.6.

Cost Estimate: $156,000.

Rank: 853.

Project ID: 376.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Ione Road.

From Street: Jackson Road.

To Street: East County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 6.17.

Map Book Grid ID: E8.

Score: 0.45.

Cost Estimate: $4,557,210.

Rank: 860.

Project ID: 402.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Laguna Road.

From Street: Twin Cities Road.

To Street: Twin Cities Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.02.

Map Book Grid ID: F7.

Score: 0.45.

Cost Estimate: $12,850.

Rank: 860.

Project ID: 496.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Power Line Road.

From Street: West Elverta Road.

To Street: North County Border.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.49.

Map Book Grid ID: A2.

Score: 0.45.

Cost Estimate: $1,098,970.

Rank: 860.

Project ID: 505.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Riley Road.

From Street: Dillard Road.

To Street: Arno Road.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.58.

Map Book Grid ID: F5.

Score: 0.45.

Cost Estimate: $1,910,235.

Rank: 860.

Project ID: 869.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Glory Lane.

From Street: Grant Line Road.

To Street: End of Street.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.50.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Score: 0.45.

Cost Estimate: $2,457,685.

Rank: 860.

*Note: The remaining projects in Table C-6 do not have entries under the columns, To Street, Score, and Rank, though these may be updated in future versions of the ATP. For now, these column headings will no longer be listed for efficiency purposes.

Table C-6 continued:

Project ID: 870.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: El Verano Avenue.
From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.
Length: (In Miles.) 1.43.
Map Book Grid ID: A4.
Cost Estimate: $1,058,928.

Project ID: 871.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Elverta Road.
From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.
Length: (In Miles.) 0.29.
Map Book Grid ID: A4.
Cost Estimate: $216,148.

Project ID: 872.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.
On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.13.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $95,717.

Project ID: 873.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Modena Avenue.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.04.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $27,271.

Project ID: 874.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $425,219.

Project ID: 875.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.17.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $124,680.

Project ID: 876.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $73,088.

Project ID: 877.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Aerojet Road.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.72.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Cost Estimate: $534,937.

Project ID: 878.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Modena Avenue.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $182,482.

Project ID: 879.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 9th Street.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $426,515.

Project ID: 880.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palladay Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $178,970.

Project ID: 881.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Palladay Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.14.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $101,235.

Project ID: 882.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 16th Street.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $497,412.

Project ID: 883.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Dry Creek Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $73,283.

Project ID: 884.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $555,944.

Project ID: 885.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Road.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.17.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $123,916.

Project ID: 886.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: 16th Street.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.00.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $739,230.

Project ID: 887.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Adair Street.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.33.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $248,532.

Project ID: 888.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: El Modena Avenue.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $555,515.

Project ID: 889.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: New Class 1.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.66.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $4,356,063.

Project ID: 890.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: New Class 1.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.72.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $2,816,351.

Project ID: 891.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: New Class 1.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.83.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $2,994,454.

Project ID: 892.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: New Class 1.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.22.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $1,999,146.

Project ID: 893.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.21.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $340,267.

Project ID: 894.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.63.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,025,519.

Project ID: 895.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.62.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,011,041.

Project ID: 896.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,059,907.

Project ID: 897.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,092,803.

Project ID: 898.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.44.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $717,482.

Project ID: 899.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.39.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $644,481.

Project ID: 900.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.52.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $850,723.

Project ID: 901.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.61.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,005,470.

Project ID: 902.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.18.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $299,536.

Project ID: 903.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.20.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $322,242.

Project ID: 904.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.31.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $512,176.

Project ID: 905.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.29.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $477,107.

Project ID: 906.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $262,637.

Project ID: 907.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.18.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $291,389.

Project ID: 908.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.79.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,292,328.

Project ID: 909.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.78.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,283,055.

Project ID: 910.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.48.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $785,221.

Project ID: 911.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.47.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $763,696.

Project ID: 912.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,884,468.

Project ID: 913.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $200,090.

Project ID: 914.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.24.

Map Book Grid ID: D7.

Cost Estimate: $387,908.

Project ID: 915.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.69.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,128,995.

Project ID: 916.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $463,290.

Project ID: 917.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.59.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $963,630.

Project ID: 918.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $437,654.

Project ID: 919.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.61.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $992,397.

Project ID: 920.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.53.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $873,151.

Project ID: 921.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $169,174.

Project ID: 922.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.25.

Map Book Grid ID: D7.

Cost Estimate: $409,944.

Project ID: 923.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.27.

Map Book Grid ID: D7.

Cost Estimate: $434,471.

Project ID: 924.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.49.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $808,777.

Project ID: 925.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.32.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $523,931.

Project ID: 926.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.53.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $2,506,102.

Project ID: 927.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,045,771.

Project ID: 928.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.41.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $670,600.

Project ID: 929.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.16.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $262,301.

Project ID: 930.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.21.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $337,312.

Project ID: 931.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.15.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,888,791.

Project ID: 932.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.64.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $2,694,274.

Project ID: 933.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.29.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $480,108.

Project ID: 934.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.36.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,749,429.

Project ID: 935.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.28.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $948,740.

Project ID: 936.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.22.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $164,355.

Project ID: 937.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $445,210.

Project ID: 938.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,582,478.

Project ID: 939.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.01.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,494,789.

Project ID: 940.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.23.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $911,734.

Project ID: 941.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.38.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $278,705.

Project ID: 942.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: D7.

Cost Estimate: $86,555.

Project ID: 943.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.61.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $1,195,503.

Project ID: 944.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.75.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $559,738.

Project ID: 945.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.74.

Map Book Grid ID: C7.

Cost Estimate: $552,191.

Project ID: 946.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Cordova Hills Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.73.

Map Book Grid ID: D7.

Cost Estimate: $542,324.

Project ID: 947.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $195,624.

Project ID: 948.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.24.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $1,665,402.

Project ID: 949.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.76.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $1,306,257.

Project ID: 950.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.66.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $1,228,978.

Project ID: 951.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.42.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $312,470.

Project ID: 952.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Elverta Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 4.86.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $7,968,821.

Project ID: 953.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Road B.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.52.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $1,128,575.

Project ID: 954.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Road A.

From Street: Elverta Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.51.

Map Book Grid ID: A4.

Cost Estimate: $1,118,635.

Project ID: 955.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.26.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Cost Estimate: $193,652.

Project ID: 956.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Aerojet Road.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.12.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Cost Estimate: $196,021.

Project ID: 957.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.60.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Cost Estimate: $988,787.

Project ID: 958.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.61.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Cost Estimate: $992,114.

Project ID: 959.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.57.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Cost Estimate: $936,638.

Project ID: 960.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Easton Place Land Use Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.58.

Map Book Grid ID: B6.

Cost Estimate: $943,219.

Project ID: 961.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.93.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $4,806,103.

Project ID: 962.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $457,924.

Project ID: 963.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.85.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Cost Estimate: $1,395,171.

Project ID: 964.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.13.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Cost Estimate: $1,845,323.

Project ID: 965.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.84.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Cost Estimate: $1,375,769.

Project ID: 966.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.47.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $2,414,397.

Project ID: 967.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.00.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Cost Estimate: $1,486,800.

Project ID: 968.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.70.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Cost Estimate: $516,290.

Project ID: 969.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.65.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Cost Estimate: $479,494.

Project ID: 970.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.37.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $275,920.

Project ID: 971.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $378,144.

Project ID: 972.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 2.21.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $3,625,813.

Project ID: 973.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.20.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $330,339.

Project ID: 974.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.18.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $131,852.

Project ID: 975.

Bicycle Class: Bicycle Lane.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 2.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.29.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $957,581.

Project ID: 976.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.22.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $2,006,119.

Project ID: 977.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.10.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $160,588.

Project ID: 978.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.67.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $1,094,038.

Project ID: 979.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.40.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $650,635.

Project ID: 980.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.32.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $2,167,026.

Project ID: 981.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.51.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $841,776.

Project ID: 982.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.20.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $326,866.

Project ID: 983.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.30.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $488,787.

Project ID: 984.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.83.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $1,363,887.

Project ID: 985.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.02.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $1,665,165.

Project ID: 986.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.30.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $2,136,882.

Project ID: 987.

Bicycle Class: Shared-Use Path.

On Street: Newbridge Specific Plan New Class 1.

From Street: Newbridge Specific Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 0.28.

Map Book Grid ID: D6.

Cost Estimate: $457,269.

Project ID: 988.

Bicycle Class: Study Corridor.

On Street: Mather South Community Master Plan New Class 4.

From Street: Mather South Community Master Plan.

Length: (In Miles.) 1.39.

Map Book Grid ID: C6.

Cost Estimate: $2,856,899.

Figure C-2. Recommended Bicycle Facilities.

Shown here is the Proposed Bicycle Facilities Locator Grid. Similar to the previous locator grid, this is an overview of the entire map book given on one page. That is, a map of Sacramento County is shown, with another layer on top of the map consisting of a series of boxes that land on areas of Unincorporated Sacramento County. Each box, and thus each area found inside a box, is labelled with their map book grid ID. (For example, A2.) The Proposed Bicycle Facilities are labelled as such: Class 1, Class 2, Class 2B, Class 3B, and Study Corridor. Other

features identified include EJ Communities, Airports, Water bodies, Parks, and Railways.

A short description of the map book grid set up is as follows: Similar to the previous map book grid, each set of ID's with the same starting letter lines up horizontally to form one row of boxes in the grid; each new set begins another row of boxes below the previous one. Sets of ID's with the same ending number would line up vertically to form the columns in the grid. For reference, the following is a complete list of map book grid ID's for the Proposed Bicycle Facilities Locator Grid, going from left to right, and top to bottom:

A2, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7;
B2, B3, B4, B5, B6, B7, B8;
C3, C4, C5, C6, C7, C8; D3, D4, D5, D6, D7, D8;
E3, E4, E5, E6, E7, E8;
F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F7, F8;
G2, G3, G4, G5, G6, G7;
H2, H3, H4, H5;
I1, I2;
J1, J2, and J3.

After this page, each succeeding page is a zoomed-in view of the map, starting with grid box A2, and going up to grid box J2. These series of maps focus on Bicycle Facilities, identifying the following features: Class 1 (Existing and Proposed), Class 2 (Existing and Proposed), Class 2B (Existing and Proposed), Class 3 (Existing only), Class 3B (Proposed only), Class 4 (Existing only), and Study Corridor (Proposed

only). Other Features identified include EJ Communities, Airports, Water bodies, Parks, and Railways.

Community Partnerships for Active Transportation Programs:

Throughout Sacramento County, there are many community-based organizations, advocacy groups, and agencies that can assist the County in supporting walking, biking, and rolling. Table C-7 provides information on how active transportation-related organizations may be able to partner with the County to implement the proposed programs.

Table C-7: Community Partners for Active Transportation Programs:

The following is a list of the Active Transportation program categories: Educational Programs, Encouragement Programs, Support Programs, Safe Routes to School Programs, Evaluation Programs, and Infrastructure Programs. In this table, the names of organizations will be listed first, followed by the categories that the organization may be a good fit to implement programs in, in partnership with the County.

AARP Sacramento Chapter:

- Educational Programs.
- Encouragement Programs.

After School Education and Safety Programs:

- Educational Programs.

- Safe Routes to School Programs.

Bike Lab:

- Educational Programs.
- Support Programs.

Black Girls Do Bike: Sacramento:

- Educational Programs.
- Encouragement Programs.

Boys and Girls Club:

- Educational Programs.
- Safe Routes to School Programs.

City Year:

- Safe Routes to School Programs.

Contagious Wheels:

- Encouragement Programs.

Health Education Council:

- Encouragement Programs.

Pro Youth and Families:

- Educational Programs.
- Safe Routes to School Programs.

Project Hero:

- Encouragement Programs.
- Support Programs.

Property Business Improvement Districts:

- Support Programs.
- Infrastructure Programs.

Sacramento Area Bicycle Advocates:

- Educational Programs.
- Encouragement Programs.
- Support Programs.
- Safe Routes to School Programs.

Sacramento Bike Hikers:

- Educational Programs.
- Encouragement Programs.
- Support Programs.

Sacramento Wheelmen Bicycle Group:

- Encouragement Programs.

Transportation Management Agencies:

- Educational Programs.
- Encouragement Programs.
- Support Programs.
- Evaluation Programs.
- Infrastructure Programs.

WALKSacramento:

- Educational Programs.
- Encouragement Programs.
- Support Programs.
- Safe Routes to School Programs.
- Evaluation Programs.

Appendix D: Procedure for Incorporating Active Transportation Plan (ATP) Changes Into GIS:

Chapter cover shows a stretch of a two-way rural road, with bikes lanes on both sides. Wide grassy lots are visible, adjacent to the street. A car is seen driving off in the far distance.

The following procedures identify the steps and individuals responsible for ensuring that changes to the Active Transportation Plan network are accurately captured in GIS and kept up to date. The actual changes to the GIS layer will be done by the County GIS Division through coordination with SacDOT's Alternative Modes Coordinator.

Recommended Active Transportation Network Changes:

Changes to the "Recommended Bicycle Network" of the ATP come from five sources.

1. Changes to the General Plan that are then incorporated into the ATP.
2. Changes to the ATP initiated by SacDOT.
3. Adoption of a Specific Plan.
4. Other parties such as Park Districts.
5. Results of a transportation study.

Proposed changes are to be routed to SacDOT's Alternative Modes Section for review and comment prior to adoption. Attribute information should include status of approval (i.e. "Recommended, Not Approved" and "Approved" and date of change. Once adopted, changes are to be routed to SacDOT's Alternative Modes Section who will coordinate with GIS Division staff.

Existing Condition Changes:

Changes to Chapter 4, "Existing Conditions" of the ATP come from five sources.

1. SacDOT capital improvement projects.
2. SacDOT maintenance division overlay projects with new bicycle striping.
3. SacDOT Alternative Modes striping and signing projects.
4. Other County Departments such as DWR or Regional Parks.
5. Developer improvement projects.

Responsibility for Transmitting Changes:

PER will be responsible for transmitting General Plan changes to the Alternative Modes Section.

The SacDOT Design Section Principal Engineer will be responsible for transmitting changes (typically as-built plans) initiated by SacDOT Capital Projects to the Alternative Modes Section.

The SacDOT Maintenance Design Section Senior Engineer will be responsible for transmitting changes (typically as-built plans in AutoCAD) initiated by SacDOT Maintenance Projects to the Alternative Modes Section.

The SacDOT Transportation Planning and Development Services Principal Engineer will be responsible for transmitting changes initiated by Specific Plans and approved Development Plans to the Alternative Modes Section.

The Alternative Modes Section will be responsible for monitoring the progress of new construction of bicycle facilities.

The Appendices document closes with a back cover showing a stretch of road, a bike lane, and a sidewalk. The backs of four people riding, rolling, and walking are seen. Two cyclists are riding in the bike lane, another commuter rides her skateboard on the sidewalk, while a pedestrian—who is also on the sidewalk—walks onward. Capping it all off is the logo of Sacramento County.

End of Sacramento County Active Transportation Plan - Appendices.