
Appendix A. Existing Conditions

Redding is the county seat of Shasta County, located at the northern end of the Sacramento Valley between the incorporated cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake. The City is home to over 91,000 people and serves as a regional center for Northern California. The topography within the City is relatively flat making bicycling and walking physically possible for a wide range of the population. The climate is relatively temperate year-round with a more notable rainy season in the winter, thereby making walking and bicycling attractive options for large portions of the year. Figure A-1 presents an overview map of the City.

The City of Redding has built a strong foundation from which to enhance walking and bicycling opportunities for community members and visitors. The walking and bicycling street and trail network in Redding is growing with continued investment by the City, which has been guided by the *Bikeway Action Plan (2010-2015)*. Such investment combined with recently completed planning activities, like the *Downtown Redding Community Based Transportation Plan* create an opportunity for the City to further improve walking and bicycling by addressing existing opportunities and gaps.

This chapter summarizes the existing conditions related to walking and bicycling in the City of Redding and also begins to introduce general ideas or concepts for consideration to improve those conditions.

Citywide Walking and Bicycling Overview

In the years following the adoption of the 1998 Redding Bicycle Plan, the City of Redding has expanded its bikeway system from a budding collection of bikeways into a coherent bikeway system connecting the City with multi-use paths and trails, bike lanes, and signed bike routes. The current official bikeway system provides over 89 designated miles of paved multi-use paths and signed on-street bike lanes and routes. The City also has an extensive sidewalk network providing a broad system of pedestrian facilities enabling connectivity between the various neighborhoods of the City. The following subsections provide an overview of various aspects of the walking and biking environment in the City of Redding.

Walking and Biking in the City of Redding

Understanding how many people are walking and biking in Redding can help the City plan projects and programs to: (1) improve the walking and biking experience for those that are already walking and biking; and (2) encourage more people to walk and bike.

Types of Walking and Biking Trips

People choose to walk or bike for a number of reasons. Walking and biking trips are typically of three types: commuting, utilitarian, or recreational. Commute trips are those where people are walking or biking as their primary means of transportation to school or work. Utilitarian trips include walking or biking to destinations to buy goods or services, or take care of other daily needs. Recreational trips are trips taken purely for pleasure, such as riding along the Sacramento River Trail or taking a stroll to the park.

Biking and Walking in Redding by the Numbers

The U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) provides annual 5-year sample estimates of a number of demographic and economic characteristics. Among these, the ACS estimates the mode (i.e., driving, walking, taking transit) by which people travel to/from work within a given geography. Table A-1 compares the mode shares from 2010 through 2015 for people traveling to/from work for the City of

Redding. This commute data is aggregated based on where people live and the mode they most typically use to commute to work.

Table A-1. Redding – How People Travel to/from Work, 2010 - 2015

Commute Mode	Commute Mode Split Percentage		
	2010	2015	% Change
Drove alone	79.1%	81.4%	2.3%
Carpooled	10.7%	8.2%	-2.4%
Public transportation	0.9%	1.0%	0.1%
Bicycle	0.8%	1.1%	0.3%
Walked	2.2%	2.0%	-0.2%
Taxicab, motorcycle, or other means	1.6%	1.1%	-0.4%
Worked at home	4.8%	5.1%	0.4%

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates

Overall, commute mode splits have stayed relatively stable over the last five years. Driving alone is the primary commute mode choice for people living in Redding, with more than four out of five people estimated to drive alone to work, a 2.3% increase from 2010. This increase can be tied to a nearly identical decrease in carpooling to work, which decreased by 2.4% of the overall commute to 8.2% of all workers. Bicycling has seen a small increase in the City’s mode splits over the five-year span, increasing from 0.8% to 1.1%, a 37.5% increase in commuting bicyclists. In contrast, walking has decreased slightly from 2.2% to 2% of all commute mode splits.

While walking as a commute mode has decreased in the City, everyone is a pedestrian at some point during their daily travels, whether it is walking to work, walking to a bus stop, or walking after driving to your destination. As a result, it is critical to provide an adequate walking environment to serve all users of the transportation system and allow convenient connections between walking trips and other modes of travel. Additionally, utilitarian and recreational walking or biking trips are not regularly estimated, and likely contribute to a larger overall population of people within the City that regularly walk or bike.

Overall, these trends point to the importance of developing a comprehensive and safe active transportation network to continue the growth in bicycling to/from work (and more broadly) and to encourage more walking by providing safe and convenient routes to destinations.

Collision Analysis

If in a collision, people walking or biking are at greater risk of being seriously injured than people driving in cars or traveling in other motorized vehicles. For this reason, pedestrians and bicyclists are considered vulnerable road users. In the City of Redding, they are also disproportionately involved in collisions given the relatively small percentage of the mode share they constitute. While pedestrians and bicyclists represent 3.1 percent of commuters within Redding, they were involved in 14.1% of reported crashes within the City over the five-year period from 2011-2015. Therefore, under current conditions in Redding, people walking and bicycling are more likely to be involved in a crash than people traveling in a car.

Pedestrians and bicyclists also represent a disproportionate share of the number of fatalities and severe injuries in the City, a pattern that is consistent with state and national trends. Based on City of Redding data, bicyclists and pedestrians are 2.7 times more likely to be killed in a crash than a person traveling in a car. Bicycle and pedestrian crash fatalities represent 34.1% of fatalities for the five-year study period (2011-2015). Additionally, bicyclists and pedestrians are 2.2 times more likely to suffer a severe injury than a person driving in a car, with bicycle and pedestrian crashes representing 30% of reported severe injury crashes in the City. This indicates a need and opportunity to improve safety for people walking and biking in Redding.

Data describing the location and nature of crashes involving pedestrians and bicyclists helps to identify locations for improvements and identify ways that other policies and programs could help improve safety for people walking and biking.

The annual number of bicycle- and pedestrian-involved reported crashes are shown in Table A- 2.¹ These crashes are also mapped in Figure A-2 for the City and Figure A-3 for the Downtown area. These figures illustrate concentrations of pedestrian and bicycle crashes across the City, notably in Downtown Redding, around the Mt. Shasta Mall shopping center, and along the Corridors of Cypress Avenue, Victor Avenue, Hartnell Avenue, Lake Boulevard, and Market Street.

Table A- 2. Redding Annual Bicycle and Pedestrian Reported Fatal and Injury Crash Frequency, 2011-2015

Year	Bicycle	Pedestrian	Total Bicycle and Pedestrian
2011	33	20	53
2012	20	14	34
2013	34	20	54
2014	44	27	71
2015	22	30	52
Total Bicycle and Pedestrian	153	111	264
5-Year Average Annual Crash Frequency for Bicycles and Pedestrians	30.6	22.2	52.8

Source: Transportation Injury Mapping System, 2011-2015.

A total of 153 bicycle crashes and 111 pedestrian crashes were reported during the five-year period analyzed from 2011-2015. Bicycle and pedestrian reported crashes exhibit a high degree of variability from a low of 34 total bicycle and pedestrian reported crashes to a high of 71 combined reported crashes. Over the five-year period, an average of approximately 31 reported bicycle crashes and 22

¹ Crash data in Table A-2 is from the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) maintained by UC Berkeley. The data identifies the location and basic circumstances of collisions that resulted in injuries and fatalities. TIMS data is based on data provided by the California Highway Patrol through their Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). SWITRS is a database of reported crashes collected by law enforcement agencies across the state. Reported crashes represent only those crashes that were documented by a law enforcement officer in the field and, as a result, represent a portion of all collisions.

reported pedestrian crashes occurred for a combined average of 53 reported crashes. Details describing key characteristics on crash severity and the primary crash factor violations for fatal or injury bicycle and pedestrian crashes, respectively, are shown in the tables below.

Table A-3. Redding Annual Bicycle Reported Fatal and Injury Crash Frequency by Severity, 2011-2015

Year	Fatality	Severe Injury	Other Visible Injury	Complaint of Pain Injury	Total Bicycle Crashes
2011	--	3	18	12	33
2012	--	1	11	8	20
2013	--	2	18	14	34
2014	1	4	17	22	44
2015	1	--	11	10	22
Total Reported Bicycle Crashes	2	10	75	66	153
Percentage of Total Reported Bicycle Crashes	1.3%	6.5%	49.0%	43.1%	--
5-Year Average Annual Crash Frequency for Bicycle Crashes	0.4	2.0	15.0	13.2	30.6

Source: Transportation Injury Mapping System, 2011-2015.

Two reported bicycle fatal crashes occurred over the five year period, one each in 2014 and 2015, the two most recent years of data available. Over the five-year window, the City has an average of two severe crashes per year. These fatal and severe crashes account for 7.8% of reported fatal or injury bicycle crashes.

Table A-4. Redding Annual Pedestrian Reported Fatal and Injury Crash Frequency by Severity, 2011-2015

Year	Fatality	Severe Injury	Other Visible Injury	Complaint of Pain Injury	Total Pedestrian Crashes
2011	2	3	6	9	20
2012	3	3	3	5	14
2013	1	6	4	9	20
2014	3	5	8	11	27
2015	4	3	6	17	30
Total Reported Pedestrian Crashes	13	20	27	51	111
Percentage of Total Reported Pedestrian Crashes	11.7%	18.0%	24.3%	45.9%	--
5-Year Average Annual Crash Frequency for Pedestrian Crashes	2.6	4.0	5.4	10.2	22.2

Source: Transportation Injury Mapping System, 2011-2015.

Over the five-year window analyzed, there is an average of 2.6 pedestrian fatal crashes per year, accounting for 11.7% of reported pedestrian fatal or injury crashes. An additional 20 reported severe pedestrian injury crashes occurred during the five-year period, resulting in 18.0% of reported pedestrian crashes resulting in a severe pedestrian injury.

Table A-5 summarizes the primary crash factor violation for bicycle crashes recorded by the police officer that submitted the crash report. The “other violation” category contains all other violation categories combined, these violation categories each represent small percentages of the total crashes. This “other violation” category reflects violations such as following too closely, or impeding traffic, among others. Unknown or not stated violations indicate crashes where no violation was recorded in the dataset.

Table A-5. Redding Reported Bicycle Fatal and Injury Crash Primary Collision Factor Violation by Year, 2011-2015

Year	Primary Crash Factor Violation for Bicycle Crashes							
	Wrong Side of Road	Automobile Right of Way	Traffic Signals and Signs	Improper Turning	Unsafe Speed	Driving Under the Influence	Other Violation	Not Stated or Unknown
2011	5	5	5	4	3	1	5	5
2012	5	1	4	3	2	1	4	0
2013	9	6	2	4	2	--	5	6
2014	14	8	8	1	3	2	5	3
2015	5	5	3	--	1	--	2	6
5-Year Total	38	25	22	12	11	4	21	20
Percentage of Total	24.8%	16.3%	14.4%	7.8%	7.2%	2.6%	13.7%	13.1%

Source: Transportation Injury Mapping System, 2011-2015.

Wrong side of the road violations account for the largest percentage (24.8%) of reported bicycle fatal and injury crashes, with 38 reported crashes. This high percentage of reported bicycle crashes could indicate the need for:

- Improved bicycle connections and crossing opportunities to provide more direct routes and frequent crossings for bicyclists needing to access stores, transit stops, employment areas and other similar destinations; and
- Increased education to make sure bicyclists know how to use the bikeway network to reach their destinations without riding the wrong way and to inform bicyclists of the risk they incur when they choose to ride the wrong way.

Bicyclist violating the “automobile right of way”, as well as bicyclists or vehicles violating “traffic signals and signs” and “improper[ly] turning” account for 16.3%, 14.4%, and 7.8% of the total, respectively. Unsafe Speed (7.2%) on the part of motorists was also a notable percentage of the total number of bicyclist-involved fatal and injury crashes. Collectively, this reinforces the need to plan, design and implement traffic control and signs that are intuitive and clear for all road users and supplement those designs with education and enforcement.

Improper behavior on the part of bicyclists or motorists can result from a variety of circumstances, including:

- (1) Misunderstanding who has the right-of-way (e.g., motorists failing to signal and check over their right shoulder prior to making a right-turn movement across a bicycle lane);

(2) Frustration that a signal or other traffic control device is not meeting their needs (e.g., a bicyclist that is not being given a green light at a traffic signal because the signal was not designed to detect bikes); or

(3) Frustration that other road users do not follow the proper rules of the road.

Designing and implementing a street network throughout the City that has all road users in-mind can help to clarify expectations for everyone, improve compliance with traffic signals and signs, make road user behavior more predictable so motorists and bicyclists can better understand and anticipate one another’s needs, and ultimately lead to fewer collisions.

Table A-6 summarizes the primary crash factor violation for pedestrian crashes recorded by the police officer that submitted the crash report. The “other violations” category combines violations that represented smaller percentages of the total, including violations such as improper turning, impeding traffic, and wrong side of road, among others. Not stated or unknown crash violations refer to crashes where no violation was recorded in the dataset.

Table A-6. Redding Reported Bicycle Fatal and Injury Crash Primary Collision Factor Violation by Year, 2011-2015

Year	Primary Crash Factor Violation for Pedestrian Crashes					
	Pedestrian Violation	Pedestrian Right of Way	Driving Under the Influence	Unsafe Speed	Other Violations	Not Stated or Unknown
2011	11	3	--	1	4	1
2012	7	3	--	1	0	3
2013	12	5	1	--	0	2
2014	12	8	--	1	3	3
2015	14	8	2	--	4	2
5-Year Total Reported Pedestrian Crashes	56	27	3	3	11	11
Percentage of Total Reported Pedestrians Crashes	50.5%	24.3%	2.7%	2.7%	9.9%	9.9%

Source: Transportation Injury Mapping System, 2011-2015.

Pedestrian violations were the most common primary crash factor violation for pedestrian crashes, accounting for over half of all reported pedestrian fatal and injury crashes (50.5%). A “pedestrian violation” is when an officer determines that a pedestrian did not appropriately follow the rules of the road. “Pedestrian right-of-way violations” were the other major violation type, accounting for 24.3% of the reported crashes; these are instances where a motorist violated the pedestrians’ right-of-way.

Similar to bicyclist crashes, the two leading violations above indicate the importance of designing and implementing a street network throughout the City that has all road users in-mind to:

- Clarify expectations for everyone;

- Improve compliance with traffic signals and signs, make destinations more accessible to pedestrians;
- Make road user behavior more predictable so everyone can better understand one another's needs; and
- Ultimately lead to fewer collisions.

Improving designs for pedestrians include considerations such as location and frequency of crossing opportunities (particularly along streets with multiple lanes of traffic, transit stops, and retail or recreational destinations) and amount of delay incurred waiting for a "walk sign" at a signal. For example, people walking to get from point A to point B, tend to take the shortest path given the amount of effort and time involved in walking vs. other modes, therefore, out of direction travel (e.g., walking a ¼ mile to the nearest signal to cross a street) is often not done and instead people attempt to cross the street midblock. Addressing these and other design considerations can help make walking a more convenient as well as less risky activity for everyone.

Land Use and Development Trends

Historical Development and Land Use Patterns

As Redding developed from a small settlement to the regional center it is today, the City's development has evolved with it. The City of Redding has transformed into a tourist and regional center for Northern California with convenient access to Shasta Lake, Whiskeytown Lake, Mount Shasta, Lassen Volcanic National Park, the Shasta-Trinity National Forest, and other popular recreational areas.

Alongside this change in character from a small mining town to a regional hub, the character of development has evolved in Redding as well. In the 1960s the Downtown served as the hub of the City, with the Downtown Mall providing a strong presence for retail and commercial offices with primarily single-family homes outside of core retail areas. Over time, commercial development moved to decentralized areas outside the downtown, such as the Mt. Shasta Mall to serve regional travelers using the state highway system. Today, the City of Redding still maintains a downtown core retail district, while also having retail and commercial strips of development along arterials such as Hilltop Drive, Dana Drive, Lake Boulevard, and Cypress Avenue indicative of more suburbanized, auto-oriented development patterns. Consistently integrating design treatments for biking and walking will be critical for the City to be able to provide access to the range of employers, retail, and other similar destinations.

Current Trends and Land Use Patterns

Beginning in 2001, the City recommitted to revitalizing the downtown area with the adoption of the Downtown Specific Plan which converted the old Downtown Mall to the Market Street Promenade in 2009. The City is currently undertaking further efforts to revitalize downtown through the recently adopted Downtown Redding Community Based Transportation plan, which specifically addresses the connection between coordinating transportation planning, including walking and biking, with economic development and revitalization of the Downtown. As can be seen in Figure A-4 and Figure A-5, the majority of the land area of Redding is dedicated to residential land uses developed as one and two-story single-family detached houses. Multifamily housing surrounds major commercial corridors and the Downtown area of the City. The Redding Downtown contains a diversity of different land uses from government offices and public facilities to restaurants and professional offices with limited residential in the area.

Activity Centers

In addition to the Downtown area described above, the City is home to a number of different activity centers. These include the Mt. Shasta Mall and the commercial corridors extending along Dana Drive to the east and Hilltop Drive to the south which provide regional shopping and related uses for the City and Shasta Region. The Turtle Bay Exploration Park, the nearby Sundial Bridge (a popular tourist destination), and numerous parks and fields throughout the City attract year-round recreation. Additionally, there are commercial and office areas along Cypress Avenue and Athens Avenue, at Lake Boulevard and Market Street, and the smaller shopping center at the southern end of the City along Market Street. Figure A-6 and Figure A-7 show identified Activity Centers within the City and Downtown area, respectively.

Recent and Funded Projects

As part of the *Bikeway Action Plan*, the City of Redding has recommitted to developing a safe and comprehensive bikeway network within the City. As a part of this recommitment, the City has undertaken a number of projects and planning studies to improve walking and biking in Redding. A few recent or ongoing projects include:

- *Downtown Redding Community Based Transportation Plan*: The previously mentioned study was adopted in December 2016 and lays out a comprehensive transportation vision for the transportation system within the Downtown area. In addition to the broad vision and goals for the Downtown area, the plan includes specific action plans relating to pedestrians, bicyclists, the Market Street Promenade, and transit access, among other issues. The action plans identify existing conditions, objectives to address each issue, and design elements to achieve the action plans objectives.
- *California Street Road Diet and Bike Lanes*: When Caltrans resurfaced California Street, the street was “rightsized” from three lanes to two lanes with buffered bike lanes and on-street parking added along the corridor.
- *Placer Street Active Transportation Project*: The City improved Placer Street from the City Limits to Pleasant Street. The project added buffered bike lanes, improved RABA transit facilities, installed enhanced pedestrian crossings and street trees, and added sidewalk with curb, gutter, and ADA improvements.
- *Victor Avenue Highway Safety and Improvement Project (HSIP)*: The City improved Victor Avenue between Enterprise Park and Churn Creek. The project implemented a road diet (reduced travel lanes), installed raised median islands, roundabouts, and lighting, added buffered bike lanes northbound and separated bike lanes southbound, and added a shared use path alongside the park.

In addition to these recent and ongoing projects, the City has a number of funded projects aimed to improve walking and biking in the City, these are briefly described below.

- *Quartz Hill Road Active Transportation Project*: The project will widen the road and implement a road diet to add bike lanes, sidewalks, and enhanced pedestrian crossing signs/beacons.
- *Dieselhorst to Downtown Active Transportation Project*: The project could provide separated bike lanes and/or shared use paths between the Dieselhorst Bridge to downtown Redding via Riverside Drive and Center Street.
- *Hartnell Ave HSIP*: The project will provide two mid-block pedestrian crossings, buffered bike lanes, ADA ramps, and complete sidewalk gaps.
- *Churn Creek Road and Maraglia Street HSIP*: The project will provide a mid-block pedestrian crossing, bike lanes, ADA ramps, lighting, and complete sidewalk gaps.

- *Redding Downtown Loop and Affordable Housing Project*: The project will provide 79 affordable housing units, convert Market, Butte, and Yuba Streets to complete streets, and provide a separated bike lane on California Street from the terminus of the Diestelhorst to Downtown Active Transportation Project to Yuba Street.
- *Victor Avenue Corridor Phasing Plan*: From Hartnell Avenue to Old Alturas Road, this plan will evaluate road modifications, as well as the incorporation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- *Bechelli Lane and Loma Vista Drive Active Transportation Project*: The project will provide buffered bike lanes, sidewalks (including filling sidewalk gaps), accessible drive ways, curb ramps, enhanced pedestrian crossings with beacons, pedestrian refuge islands, and other pedestrian safety amenities.
- *Annual Sidewalk Replacement*: The City has dedicated funding for annual ongoing sidewalk replacements throughout the City.
- *ADA Curb Ramp Installation*: The City has dedicated funding to install ADA-accessible curb ramps at various intersections throughout the City.

These recent, ongoing, and upcoming projects illustrate Redding’s commitment to improving walking and biking in the City, whether it is adding sidewalk to improve safe routes to school or adding buffered bike lanes along street corridors.

Bicycle Facilities

Overview of Bikeway Classifications

Jurisdictions within California organize bicycle facilities into the following classifications; these serve as a common terminology across the state making it easier to understand the degree to which space on a street or within a general right-of-way is being uniquely designated for people bicycling.

- Class I Bikeway (Bike Path) - Provides a completely separated right-of-way for the exclusive use of people bicycling and walking. The number and frequency of cross streets carrying motorists is minimized to the extent possible.
- Class II Bikeway (Bike Lane) - Provides a striped lane for one-way bicycle travel on a street or highway.²
- Class III Bikeway (Bike Route) - Provides for shared use with people walking or motor vehicle traffic.
- Class IV Bikeway (Separated Bikeway) - A bikeway for the exclusive use of people biking that includes separation between the bikeway and the through vehicular traffic. The separation may include, but is not limited to, grade separation, flexible posts, inflexible physical barriers (e.g., concrete median), on-street parking, or a combination of treatments.

The City of Redding’s existing bikeway network includes Class I, Class II, and Class III bicycling facilities. The following section describes the existing bikeway network.

Existing Bikeway Network

The existing bikeway network is comprised of a combination of Class I, Class II and Class III bicycling facilities; these are displayed citywide in Figure A-8 and for the Downtown area in

² 1000-2 Highway Design Manual, June 26, 2006

Figure A-9. The relatively comprehensive coverage of the bikeway network is an outcome of the City's efforts in developing and implementing the *Bikeway Action Plan* for 2010-2015. The principles the City used in the *Bikeway Action Plan* were:

- Residents can conveniently use bicycles as transportation for their recreational, occupational, and educational needs, and to complete other daily errands.
- Every bicycle trip improves the quality of life for all.
- Bicycles can be used safely.

Using the above principles, the plan identified extensive lists of upgrades to existing Class I, II, and III facilities as well as new proposed Class I, II and III facilities across the City. The intent of the improvements identified in the *Bikeway Action Plan* was to reach, by 2015, a complete bikeway system network totaling 162.81 miles of dedicated paved multi-use paths and on-street signed routes to serve current and future needs, with a significant portion of the on-street system upgraded to a Class II bicycle lane. The City has made significant progress in implementing this vision, but still has many opportunities to provide a more cohesive bikeway network for users of all ages and abilities.

As shown in Figure A-8, the Sacramento River Trail is the most extensive Class I facility within the City of Redding providing connectivity east-west along the Sacramento River as well as a few connections north-south across it. It also provides a connection to recreational areas outside and west of the City of Redding. Additional shared use paths are also present in smaller, more isolated locations providing connections from neighborhoods to local retail centers or from one neighborhood to an adjacent neighborhood. For example, the shared use path that runs parallel to Buena Ventura Boulevard.

As noted above, Class II bicycle facilities (bicycle lanes) have been implemented on portions of key corridors such as Bonnie View Road, Victor Avenue, Cypress Avenue, Pine Street, California Street, Canby Road, and Bechelli Lane. Many of the remaining streets providing consistent east-west and north-south connectivity across the City are currently Class III bicycle facilities (bicycle route) meaning designated as a bicycle route but a space where people bicycling are sharing the travel lane with motorists.

The City has definitely made progress towards achieving the principles noted in the *Bikeway Action Plan*. Based on the City's current bicycling facilities, there continues to be opportunities to further improve and enhance the network to better meet those three principles.

Bicycle Support Facilities and Amenities

Bicycling support facilities and amenities include bicycle parking, bicycle shops, and repair stations (e.g., a place to put air in a low tire or fix a flat tire). These are part of making bicycling a more convenient and viable transportation mode. Figure A-10 and Figure A-11 illustrate where such amenities are located throughout the City and in the Downtown area, respectively. In total there are 66 locations with bicycle racks; many are concentrated in the Downtown area and/or near shopping or commercial centers. At the local farmers market on Saturdays each week, there is also a bicycle valet service that helps encourage people to ride their bikes to/from the market. There are a total of five bicycle shops across the City, which are: The Bike Shop, Sports LTD, Chain Gang, Bikes Etc., Village Cycle, and Cyclopedia. There is one confirmed fix-it repair station within the City.

To help encourage bicycling, secure and convenient bicycle parking is often one of the most sought after amenities to support bicycling. For people commuting by bicycle, facilities such as showers and changing rooms at or near their place of employment are also desirable.

Pedestrian Facilities

Overview of Pedestrian Facility Types

Pedestrian facilities generally include, but are not necessarily limited to, sidewalks, trails, multiuse paths, curb ramps, crosswalks, crossing aids (e.g., pedestrian crosswalk indicators), traffic control devices aimed at facilitating pedestrian crossings (e.g., flashing beacons at crosswalks), grade separated crossings, and other strategies to encourage and improve conditions for walking.

Existing Pedestrian Network

The existing pedestrian network in the City of Redding is made up of shared use paths and sidewalks. The City has strong sidewalk coverage in the Downtown core area, adjacent to and within many of the retail centers, and within most of the residential neighborhoods. Figure A-12 illustrates the existing sidewalk coverage and connectivity of the current shared use paths for the City. Figure A-13 illustrates the sidewalk coverage and connectivity for the Downtown area.

In 2015, a safety assessment was conducted for the Downtown area of Redding. It was conducted by SafeTREC and California Walks with recommendations published in June 2015. The study included workshops with community members, walkability assessment, field work, and a final report. The final report documents the following community member and California Walks/SafeTREC recommendations.

- Community member recommendations:
 - Establish pedestrian-friendly motor vehicle speeds through adjustments to the traffic signal timing in downtown. Pedestrian friendly speeds are considered 25 mph or slower. California Street, Market Street and Pine Street were of particular interest.
 - Create safer intersections with curb extensions and pedestrian signal timing adjustments. Curb extensions to reduce crossing distances for pedestrians and slow turning vehicles. Pedestrian signal timing adjustments to provide automatic recall for the pedestrian crossing movement and implement leading pedestrian intervals. Market/Placer, Placer/California, and Pine/Yuba intersections were identified as three intersections with the greatest need.
 - Ensure Market Street remains a pedestrian-priority street and continue to make changes to enforce it as such.
 - Provide shade throughout downtown to make walking and being a pedestrian in that area more welcoming.
 - Explore options for a downtown parking policy.
 - Improve downtown walkability through parklets, wayfinding, and lighting.
- California Walks/SafeTREC recommendations:
 - Develop a crosswalk marking and enhancement policy.
 - Establish a Pedestrian Advisory Committee.
 - Implement pedestrian pushbutton “hot response” for quicker actuation of the pedestrian crossing phase during off-peak periods.

In addition to the Downtown area as a key pedestrian-oriented area, other areas within the City of Redding that should be continually assessed and worked on to improve conditions for walking include schools,

particularly neighborhood schools that need to be accessible to children of all ages, shopping centers such as Mount Shasta Mall and Cypress Square, and transit hubs and stops.

Pedestrian Amenities

There are a number of parks and trails throughout the City that serve as attractive destinations for people walking and can also serve as useful connections to other destinations. The Sacramento River Trail is one example where people may use the trail as a destination in of itself to recreate and they may also use it as a means for reaching another a destination. Other notable pedestrian destinations within the City, beyond the retail and commercial areas, include the Sundial Bridge, Enterprise Community Park, and Turtle Bay Park. These and other potential common destinations for people walking, such as schools, are shown on in Figure A-14 and the comment destinations for the Downtown area are highlighted in Figure A-15.

Transit Connections

Overview

The Redding Area Bus Authority (RABA) provides a fixed route and demand responsive transit services to the City of Redding and the broader urbanized area of Shasta County. The RABA fixed route service consists of eleven local routes and four express and commuter routes. RABA has three transit centers: the Downtown Transit Center, the Masonic Transfer Center, and the Canby Transfer Center. These three transit centers have the highest volume of passenger activities with over 500 boardings and alightings per day allowing riders to transfer to another route or walk to nearby regional destinations. According to the most recent RABA *2014 Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP)*, ridership of fixed route service has steadily grown serving over 800,000 individual rides for the fiscal year 2012/2013. This represents a 23% increase in riders from the fiscal year 2009/2010 to the fiscal year 2012/2013.

Access to Transit

Improving walking and biking access to transit centers and stops is an important part of supporting active transportation. This support provides greater options for people to make walking or bicycling a part of their daily life. For those without access to a vehicle, walking or biking to transit can provide essential access to areas outside of typical walking or biking range. Additionally, improving walking and biking access encourages alternative transportation modes and generates health, stimulates the local economy, and provides environmental benefits from reduced driving. Currently, RABA accommodates “bike and ride” with a bike rack on every fixed route and express or commuter route bus. According to the RABA 2014 SRTP, the three stops with the highest frequency of bicycle boardings or alightings are the three transit centers: Downtown Transit Center (9 routes), Masonic Avenue Transfer Center (3 routes), Canby Road Transit Center (6 routes).

RABA also provides bus stop and signing infrastructure throughout the system to clearly mark bus stops. Additionally, heavily utilized stops have bus shelters to provide people walking or biking to transit shade and cover from inclement weather. Improving walking and biking access to transit can be accomplished in a number of ways from providing automated vehicle location information so that riders can be confident in their bus’s arrival to providing safe and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant access to stations.

Transit Service and Access Areas

Figure A-16 and Figure A-17 show the existing transit service in the City of Redding and Downtown area, respectively. The maps highlight the RABA service routes, bus stop locations, as well as half-mile “access

areas” to the system’s bus stops. All local routes operate for approximately 12 hours per day Monday through Friday, with more limited service hours on Saturday. Bus service is not provided on Sundays. All of the RABA local routes within the City of Redding operate on one-hour headways. The system relies heavily on transfers with most routes stopping at two transfer centers. The RABA 2014 SRTP notes that nearly two-thirds of riders surveyed use more than one bus to complete their one-way trip.

Transit access areas represent the typical distance for people walking or biking to transit for use in planning. Assuming a typical bicycling speed of 10 mph and walking speed of 3 mph, this access area represents a five to fifteen minute bike ride or walk to access the bus stop. As can be seen in the figure, the core corridors and commercial areas of City and especially the Downtown area are well-served by transit, while suburban and rural neighborhoods in the City’s outlying areas typically have limited or no access to transit.

Wayfinding

Wayfinding allows people walking and biking in the City of Redding to locate themselves and navigate to places and attractions within the City. Implementing an effective wayfinding system can enhance biking and walking by providing orientation as well as signaling the presence of walking and biking options to existing and potential users.

Following the adoption of the Downtown Redding Specific Plan, the City established a Wayfinding Committee to assist in developing a wayfinding program to help guide people to and from the Downtown area. This wayfinding program focused on three areas:

1. **Gateways:** Gateways provide a physical indication that people have arrived in Downtown Redding. Gateways are planned for the following five entry points into Downtown:
 - Market Street at Shasta Street;
 - Eureka Way at the Union Pacific Railroad Overpass;
 - Shasta Street at East Street;
 - Pine Street at South Street; and
 - Placer Street at Union Pacific Railroad Crossing.
2. **Vehicular Signs:** Vehicular signs provide directional information to drivers along major corridors leading into Downtown to guide them to Downtown, within Downtown to destinations, and to other nearby points of interest.
3. **Kiosk Signs:** Kiosk signs were developed to help people walking and biking navigate downtown. Currently there are six pedestrian directory signs in Downtown Redding.

Building off of the existing wayfinding program, the City of Redding can continue to improve walking and biking within the City by providing clear and consistent guidance to people walking and biking in order to access key destinations and neighborhoods.

Maintenance Practices

Maintenance is a critical component to ensuring that people walking and biking have safe and comfortable facilities. Maintenance for sidewalks, bikeway facilities, signs, and other pavement markings related to walking and biking on streets and roadways is the responsibility of the Streets Division of the City’s Public Works Department. The City of Redding Community Services Department is responsible for the maintenance of shared-use paths. Both activities are funded through the City’s General Fund. Maintenance has many components and can include the use of volunteers, citizen input on debris and other hazards, and regularly scheduled street and path maintenance. The City operates an

online Street Service Request form to allow the City to receive and respond to a variety of street maintenance requests, including obstacles encountered by people walking and biking in Redding³.

Bikeway Maintenance

The City sweeps all streets every four weeks and as a standard practice includes the full width of the bicycle travel area in addition to the parking lane. The following table provides the maintenance types and recommended frequencies for bike lanes and bike routes adopted as part of the City's *Bikeway Action Plan*.

Table A-7. Redding Recommended Maintenance Practices for Bike Facilities

Maintenance Type	Recommended Frequency
Major damage response (fallen trees, washouts, flooding)	Schedule based on priorities
Pavement sealing, pothole repair	5 – 15 years
Maintain clean walkways and roadside areas	80% of areas maintained to “satisfactory” level
Sweep roadways	100% of roadways with frequent bike use every two weeks
Pavement markings replacement	1 – 3 years
Signage replacement	1 – 3 years
Maintain vegetation (for encroachment into the roadway or obscuring sight distance)	Within 24 hours of report
Sweep during construction	Daily
Drainage maintenance and inspections	Before the wet season and after major storms
Roadway Inspections	Seasonal - at the beginning and end of summer

Source: City of Redding, *Bikeway Action Plan (2010-2015)*.

Sidewalk Maintenance

The City has an extensive sidewalk system. Sidewalk maintenance includes repairing raised, cracked, and broken sidewalk located within the City right-of-way. These repairs are completed on an as-needed basis. When observed by City personnel or notification by a citizen, the location is inspected and, if repair is warranted, the location is immediately painted fluorescent orange to alert pedestrians to the irregularity. As soon as possible, the irregularity is either temporarily or permanently repaired. As funds are available, the City contracts with a contractor for an annual sidewalk repair project to permanently repair as many locations as possible.

Support Programs

A brief description of the programs supporting walking and biking in the City of Redding that are known and active are below.

³ The request form can currently be found on the City's website at the following link: <http://www.cityofredding.org/departments/public-works/streets/street-maintenance-request>

Healthy Shasta is a partnership of over 20 organizations focused on increasing healthy and active living. One of Healthy Shasta's goals is to increase walking and bicycling among students and adults by working with partners to create environments that are safe, easy, and convenient, while providing education, encouragement, and support. Healthy Shasta provides print and online walking and bicycling maps, is focused on expanding and linking people to walking groups, assists worksites in encouraging employees to walk and bicycle, and teaches bicycle safety skills.

Safe Routes to School (SRTS) is run by the Shasta County Health and Human Services Agency. It serves multiple school districts to improve safety and encourage more students to walk and bicycle to school. Sample activities include implementing pedestrian and bicycle safety curriculums in local schools, providing training and resources to schools hosting walking school buses, Walk to School Day events, and Bike to School Day events, and training crossing guards.

Shasta Living Streets is a local nonprofit organization dedicated to advancing the development of better bikeways and trails, walkable cities, and vibrant public places in Shasta County. They provide bicycle valet parking at the local farmer's market each Saturday. Additionally, they help to organize events, such as Family Bicycling Day.

The Shasta Wheelmen is a local bicycling club that was founded in 1970. They offer regular group rides, an annual Century, and advocacy on behalf of the local bicycling community.

Shasta Bike Month and Challenge, coordinated by a variety of local organizations (including the City of Redding), takes place each May. The challenge includes worksite and school teams that encourage people to try bicycling more often. Bike Month activities include the "Ride with a Transportation Official" bike ride, the "Spring Spin" social event, outdoor 'bike-in' movies, and other activities to create enthusiasm and support for bicycling while fostering a bike culture.

The City of Redding Active Transportation Advisory Group, composed of bicycle advocates, pedestrian advocates, funding partners, schools, businesses, social service agencies, and other members of the public, meets quarterly to discuss active transportation in the community.

Figure A-1. City of Redding Overview






Figure A-2. City of Redding Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes, 2011-2015




Source: Transportation Injury Mapping System, 2011-2015.

Figure A-3. Downtown Redding Bicycle and Pedestrian Crashes, 2011-2015



Source: Transportation Injury Mapping System, 2011-2015.

Figure A-4. City of Redding Existing Land Use



Existing Land Use

City of Redding

Figure A-5. Downtown Redding Existing Land Use




Figure A-6. City of Redding Activity Centers





Figure A-7. Downtown Redding Activity Centers



Activity Centers

Downtown Redding

Figure A-8. City of Redding Existing Bikeway Network




Figure A-9. Downtown Redding Existing Bikeway Network




Figure A-10. City of Redding Bicycle Amenities




Figure A-11. Downtown Redding Bicycle Amenities




Figure A-12. City of Redding Existing Pedestrian Facilities




Figure A-13. Downtown Redding Existing Pedestrian Facilities






Figure A-14. City of Redding Pedestrian Amenities



Pedestrian Amenities

City of Redding

Figure A-15. Downtown Redding Pedestrian Amenities



Pedestrian Amenities

Downtown Redding

Figure A-16. City of Redding Transit Service





Figure A-17. Downtown Redding Transit Service



Appendix B. Public Outreach

This Appendix provides a summary of the two-phase public outreach process. It should be noted that both the *City of Redding Active Transportation Plan* and the *GoShasta Regional Active Transportation Plan* utilized the same public outreach process.

Phase I Community Outreach Summary

A variety of outreach and engagement strategies were used to gather input from residents on existing conditions, opportunities, and challenges related to walking and bicycling. This section summarizes these strategies and the input received.

Pre-Charrette Outreach

Leading up to the opening outreach campaign, the consultant team worked with the City of Redding to engage stakeholders through consultation with the City of Redding Active Transportation Advisory Group, conduct online and off-line outreach, and ultimately engage hundreds of people in the active transportation planning process.

Citizen Advisory Committees

Advisory group members completed an initial online survey to help identify specific locations to evaluate for bicycle and pedestrian safety, as well as to make recommendations for community outreach; the survey was also distributed regionally to help inform the *GoShasta Regional Active Transportation Plan*. Of the 42 total respondents, 30 represented the Redding area and two represented the Cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake, with the remaining representing the outlying unincorporated areas. Most respondents (78 percent) indicated that they were recreational cyclists, with many also indicating they were commuting cyclists or mountain bikers as well. Approximately 50 percent of survey respondents indicated that all types of active transportation should be the focus of the plans, including: walking, biking, access for disabled individuals, and transit connections.

Figure B-1 Response to the Top Focus Priority for Accessing Destinations





Figure B-2 Response to what type of cyclist are you most like




Project Website and Online Tools

The goshasta.org website was launched in January 2017 to provide a virtual project interface for both plans. An online survey and WikiMap (i.e., online map that allows viewers to add comments) provided a web-based venue for public participation, effectively expanding ways for the public to get involved in the project without the need to travel to a workshop. The website was promoted through social media, event flyers, print media, and targeted outreach to stakeholders. The results of online engagement are discussed in detail in the “Online Engagement Tools” sections that follows.

Media

A mixed media approach was utilized to publicize the launch of the plans. Media outreach focused on educating the public about the planning process and promoting public involvement. A media release was distributed to the region’s print media and newspapers, supported by a social media campaign and bi-lingual charrette event flyers. Local agencies and organizations assisted City of Redding in distributing the media release to press contacts, as well as with boosting the social media campaign on Facebook and Twitter.

Figure B-3 Social Media Outreach for the Plans



A charrette flyer (Figure B-4) was distributed electronically, in print, and via social media to promote in-person and online participation. A Spanish language flyer was also provided.

Figure B- 4 Flyer advertising the charrette



Get involved in walking and biking in the Shasta Region!

The GoShasta Regional and City of Redding Active Transportation Plans provide a coordinated approach to active transportation, resulting in plans that enable the region to compete for funding that supports walking and biking.

It's easy to participate:

- Attend one of the community workshops
- Provide input online

For more information and to participate online:
GoShasta.org

The GoShasta Regional and Redding Active Transportation Plans are funded through California's Active Transportation Program, awarded to the Shasta Regional Transportation Agency.

Monday, February 6
Redding Workshop
6:00-8:00 pm
 Redding City Hall | Community Room | 777 Cypress Ave.

Tuesday, February 7
Burney Workshop
5:30-7:30 pm
 Burney VFW Hall | 37410 Highway 299 East

Wednesday, February 8
Shasta Lake Workshop
5:30-7:30 pm
 John Beaudet Community Center | 1525 Median Ave.

Thursday, February 9
Anderson Workshop
5:30-7:30 pm
 Community Center | 1887 Howard St.

Refreshments provided!



Targeted Outreach and Personal Invitations

In addition to promoting participation through mass media and social media, the Local Government Commission worked with the city to engage local agency staff, decision makers, and local organizations. Through personalized emails and phone calls, agency staff, and active transportation advocates were invited to participate in a series of stakeholder meetings, walk audits, and workshops.

City of Redding Active Transportation Advisory Group Meeting

On Monday, February 6th, the project team met with the Advisory Group. The project team presented on the status of the project and the Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) Methodology. The discussion centered around projects and policies that would improve walking and biking conditions in Redding and included a visioning exercise.

Advisory Group members highlighted motor vehicle speeds as a major issue. People do not feel safe walking and biking where speeds are high. For example, posted speeds downtown are 30mph, but one-way streets, wide lanes, and freeway-style signage encourage people to drive much faster.

Making connections was another topic of discussion. There is evidence, as indicated by the large numbers of people walking and biking on the Sacramento River Trail, that many people have a desire to walk and bike but only do so on safe, comfortable facilities. If the trails were connected to downtown and economic centers on comfortable facilities, many more people might choose to walk and bike for transportation purposes. Hilltop, Turtle Bay, and Downtown were suggested as neighborhoods that should be prioritized for connections because they are already relatively high density, walkable areas.

Visioning Exercise

Advisory Group members were asked to form small groups to discuss their vision for the plan. Groups reported three key words that describe what they would like to see from the plan. In addition to safety, which was the most common term, the following words (similar concepts are grouped together) were mentioned:

- Connections, Seamless, Saturated
- Enjoy, Lifestyle, Beauty
- Historical
- World-Class, Infrastructure
- Data Driven

Stakeholder Meetings

City of Redding

The project team held a Redding stakeholders' meeting held on February 6, 2017, which was well attended and included representatives from the Parks, Planning, Communications Public Works, Fire and Police Departments, the Shasta Union School District and Turtle Bay. Stakeholders identified several challenges and opportunities related to walking and biking in Redding.

Challenges

The Chief of Police pointed out that they do not have the resources to patrol the existing trails, much less any new miles of trail. Police can be assigned to the trail but they use overtime pay; it is not a sustainable solution. The Chief stated that Redding and its trails are actually very safe, but incidents receive heavy coverage by the media, which influences people's perception of safety.

Additional funds for policing, lighting, and emergency call boxes on the trail may help influence people's perception of safety and willingness to use the trails.

Education for bicyclists, motorists, and pedestrians was discussed. Infrastructure is often disconnected, so bicyclists and pedestrians may take risks to cut across traffic or cross the street without the benefit of a crosswalk, while motorists may speed and not be aware of other road users. Additional infrastructure and speed management may help address these issues and could be accompanied by education and outreach.

Opportunities

The Redding area already has some great recreational trails. If these trails could be connected to downtown (potentially through Turtle Bay) and other commercial centers, there is a potential for economic benefits from tourists, as well as increased recreational and transportation options for residents.

Specific projects discussed include a trail on Churn Creek, which the parks department has identified as a north-south trail arterial. The planning and development of this trail are in the preliminary stages, and property must be acquired first.

Stakeholders were very positive about the opportunities for additional infrastructure on City streets. Road diets have been well received in the past, which are opportunities to add bicycle facilities to a street. The fire department understands the desire for narrower travel lanes to slow traffic and accommodate bike

lanes, but requires assurances that response vehicles will still be able to make necessary turning movements.

The Redding school district does not bus any children that are less than three miles away from school. With the support of the Shasta Safe Routes to School program, providing routes for children to walk and bike to school could be a huge opportunity. This would reduce school drop-off and pick-up activity and increase children's activity levels.

Walk Audits

Walk audits and bicycle assessments were conducted in Redding during the week of February 6th, 2017. The audits focused on evaluating and discussing the safety and quality of the pedestrian and bicycle environments, as well as how facilities could be improved to support walking and cycling.

Figure B-5 Walk and Bike Audits in Redding



Despite record rainfall, advocates and agency staff joined SRTA staff, City of Redding staff, and the consultant team for walk and bike audits.

Figure B-6 Redding Walk Audit Map



The Redding walk audit focused on the downtown area surrounding the pedestrian mall. Concerns about a lack of designated bike lanes, gaps in pedestrian infrastructure, ADA accessibility and vehicle speeds

were raised. Recent improvements to pedestrian facilities along Placer Street were noted as examples of a safe and enjoyable pedestrian environment.

Public Workshop

On February 6, 2017 from 6-8 pm, a public workshop was held at Redding City Hall to talk about the plan. Following introductions, the workshop opened with a 20-minute presentation on active transportation by Paul Zykofsky of the Local Government Commission. Visual examples were provided of complete streets, traffic calming techniques, good sidewalk design, high visibility and protected pedestrian crossings, and different types of bicycle facilities. Following the presentation, participants were invited to visit a series of stations to provide input on active transportation needs and priorities, summarized in the “Workshop Comments” section below. In addition, a visioning exercise was conducted, which is discussed in the “Active Transportation Vision” section. Free refreshments were provided at each of the workshops, made possible by funding the Local Government Commission received from The California Endowment.

Figure B-7 The Redding workshop attendees



Workshop Comments

Because the workshop was serving as outreach for both plans, attendees were mostly from Redding, but some also traveled from surrounding areas.

Two maps were provided for people to input their comments. Some of the most common comments included opportunities for new trails, such as along the ACID canal, Churn Creek, Oregon Gulch, and Jenny Creek. Many comments expressed a desire for safe crossings of roadways, such as Eureka Way and Cypress Ave.

Figure B-8 Area residents Assist with Prioritization

Active Transportation Vision

During the workshop, participants were asked to imagine their active transportation future. Responses were written on index cards and represent participants' vision for active transportation in Redding.

The following visions were collected from workshop participants.

- Planning, building and maintaining facilities for all modes with safe options with a complete network – collaboration.
- I would like to see multiple ways for people to get around the County safely and timely without having to rely on vehicles.



Figure B-9 Emerging Themes from the Visioning Exercise



- Redding is like Paris.
- Make Shasta County Great Again. Clean up the bike lanes. Repaint the Class II lanes. Fill the potholes. Have safer road for bikes. Extend the fog lines and mark them. Have signs on the road that read, “Bikes on the roadways”.
- Alternative transportation to shopping and recreation. More respect for the cyclist/pedestrian. Covered bike parking. More greenways with bike/pedestrian paths.
- Diagonal parking spaces throughout the downtown are for ease of access to businesses, including through downtown mall area. Sidewalks, sidewalks, sidewalks! Especially in business areas, with flashing, well-marked crosswalks in major traffic areas.
- A system of trails, bikeways and complete streets that line neighborhoods, communities, and destinations. This system will be suitable for all ages and abilities, providing safe, secure, enjoyable and convenient options for travel.
- Protected bike/walk corridors. Connecting the cities and towns in the region. Allowing safe non-motorized travel between the various population areas.
- A robust active transportation network that lets people of all ages and abilities safely walk or bike for pleasure, commute or errands. An equitable network that will unlock our economic potential, result in better health outcomes, and help build a more sustainable community.
- Connect Millville to Shingletown. Connect Shasta Lake City to Lakehead. Connect Anderson to Red Bluff. Connect Redding to Lewiston. Try to use paved trails for these connections. South 273 between the Mission and Westwood Village there is no safe pedestrian bike crossing. Lights are timed for cars.
- Bike trails without cars. Downtown no cars, walkable, well-lit for safe walking in evenings. Bike routes away from busy, fast streets. Bike lockers at train, bus, and malls.
- A world-class network of trails, separated bikeways, and neighborhood streets to connect to all schools, destinations, shopping and residential. Where everyone will have access to a bikeway from their neighborhood and 90% of school kids will walk, bike or ride transit to school.
- Bicycle rentals throughout town. Bicycle repair co-op. Wider bike lane on Eureka Way.
- Expanded urban, city streets that are safe and well connected to services, residential, work and recreation. i.e. Diestelhorst to downtown.
- Safe, connected dedicated bike paths that connect to hot beds of activity, i.e. 299 Redding to Wiskeytown, Placer to Igo/Ono, Redding to Anderson via ACID.
- Bike lockers or bike check-in at stores and restaurants. North and southbound bike-lanes over Shasta lake “new bridge”.

- To be able to ride a bike on every street. Would include marked bike lanes that are kept clean. All businesses have bike racks.
- Convenient, safe, inviting, easy to use of all ages and fitness levels. Contiguous facilities (no gaps). Connected to nature. Shade. Fun.
- The City of Redding is a community that makes walking easy between neighborhoods and core areas; a city where bicycle commuting is fun, easy and safe. Around the town are recreational walking and biking trails that are the envy of many other cities. Our trails are safe, scenic and valuable for exercise, family fun, walking for pleasure, biking to work and more.
- In 10 years... Every road will have a bike lane. Most people in urban areas would be able to opt out of using a car. In 20 years... Cars would no longer be the dominant form of transportation, rather: bikes, transit, walking.
- Vibrant arts community with well-developed infrastructure. Safe streets via both the ability to readily walk or bike throughout the greater Redding area and regarding crime rates.
- In 10 years... Protected bike lanes throughout the City. Safe access to all paved and/or unpaved trails surrounding Redding Electric, solar-powered mass transit. In 20 years... Less reliance on internal combustion, increased solar/electric powered vehicles, more ped/biking opportunities.
- A paved trail bordering the ACID Canal from Turtle Bay to beyond Anderson. A trail bordering the west side of the Sacramento River from Turtle Bay to Cypress. A trail following Caboose Creek from the hill to the river.
- Create a network of complete streets and trails for walking and biking that are so well connected and attractive for all ages and abilities that driving a car is an option not a necessity.
- Completely protected multi-use network covering the region including the ability to connect to nearby counties and safe and convenient bike parking at all destinations. This will help solve poverty here.
- Full inclusion of people with disabilities in the planning process. Robust backbone of Class I separated paths away from autos.
- Major roads with proper bike lanes, including rural and mountainous routes like Keswick Dam road and Dry Creek Road. Safe Routes to Trails. Safe crossings with LEDs. Bike lockers or safe places to lock them.
- Safe street crossings. Connectivity of bike paths.
- Improved running/biking path along the length of the Sacramento. More hiking and biking at both lakes. Pedestrian-only thoroughfares in downtown.
- Totally walkable and bike-friendly trails and streets. Make it easy for people to walk/bike from outlying areas to downtown shops, restaurants hotels/motels, etc. without conflict with motor vehicle traffic.
- I can safely get anywhere I need to go on a dedicated walking/biking path without getting in my car. Biking is safe for children. Vibrant center of town.
- A lot of river access points. More extensive river trails system.
- An interlinked network of trails and bike lanes connecting Shasta Lake, Redding, Anderson, Cottonwood, Palo Cedro, old Shasta and Centerville that allows safe recreational and commuter cycling to/from the urban centers and connections to rural areas.
- More green space in and around transit routes. Diminished use of cars as a whole. Link to major recreational areas for bikes. Safe bike paths connecting all major business and residential areas. Pedestrian links to river from downtown. Easy and convenient transit.
- Develop Park Marina area into mixed public use, a cycling hub with food, activities, parks, retail, with full access to river.
- Bike only trails from outer communities into the downtown area for safer commuting. Trails for road bikes throughout the County for enjoyment.

- Pedestrian connection between Turtle Bay and the waterfront along Park Marina over/under Hwy 44. Well-established river walk along Park Marina, with restaurants, businesses, outdoor activity areas.

Online Engagement Tools

Online Survey

An online survey was made available from January 10th to February 28th. Survey respondents were asked questions regarding what type of bicycle rider type they identify themselves as, barriers to riding a bicycle and walking, strengths and weaknesses of the bikeway and sidewalk network, open comments, and typical demographic information. The survey was completed by Redding residents and other interested in the plans.

Bicycling Results

Personal security was reported as a concern for many people who are interested in bicycling but are concerned with the perception of crime in the area, particularly as it relates to being alone and outside at night. In addition to personal security, the lack of safe places to secure a bicycle at destinations was a common theme, which was a moderate reason why some people choose not to ride their bicycle. Some respondents suggested that popular destinations should provide secured bicycle lockers to eliminate or reduce the possibility of bike theft or theft of bicycle accessories, which would encourage people to choose to ride their bicycle more often.

Large distances between desired destinations and survey respondents' homes make bicycling a relatively unattractive mode of transportation. In addition to the lack of close-by destinations, people stated that it is difficult to carry goods/packages and/or children on their bicycles, which is made more difficult when having to bicycle on uncomfortable roadways with far apart destinations.

Debris in bike lanes causing flat tires and unsafe riding conditions is a concern that was voiced by many survey respondents. Complaints of rocks, thorns, trash, and sharp objects within bike facilities or on shoulders make it unappealing to ride a bicycle and potentially unsafe. Some people mentioned they ride exclusively on off-street trails due to damaging debris that is in the roadway. While this barrier to bicycling was not a major reason identified when directly asked whether maintenance was a barrier, this was a reoccurring theme in the write-in comment section.

Weather also impacts peoples' decision to ride a bicycle. In the summer, temperatures rise to an uncomfortable level and cause a higher amount of perspiration. Many respondents stated they do not want to arrive to their destinations sweaty and avoid riding a bicycle for commuting or utility purposes during the summer months.

Traffic-related reasons that discourage bicycling had strong effect on whether people choose to ride a bicycle in Redding. Motor vehicle speeds, motorists being inconsiderate or inattentive, existing bicycle facilities do not feel safe, and existing bicycle facilities do not go to desired destinations. Motor vehicle speeds and motorist actions were a strong theme that emerged through the write-in comment sections.

If bicycling in Shasta County improved and felt more comfortable and safer, 68% of respondents reported they would regularly ride a bicycle or at least five or more days a week, a large increase from the current share of respondents (31%) who ride regularly or more than 5 days a week (Figure B-10). To assess what type of bicycle facilities are desired, survey respondents were shown images of different types of bike facilities and asked how comfortable that feel or would feel riding on each bicycle facility. Bicycle

facilities that provide the least amount of physical separation between bicyclists and motorists have the lowest levels of comfort and conversely is true with bicycle facilities with higher levels of physical separation. Rural roadways and marked shared lanes were found to be the least comfortable bike facility types and multi-use trails and protected bike lanes with curbs and/or vertical separation have the highest report level of comfort (Table B-1).

Figure B-10 Current and Future Preference to Bicycling




Table B-1 Level of Comfort by Bike Facility Type

Bike Facility Type	Very uncomfortable	Somewhat uncomfortable	Somewhat comfortable	Very comfortable	% Feel At Least Somewhat Comfortable
Rural Road w/ Littler to No Shoulder	44%	35%	15%	6%	21%
Marked Shared Lane	33%	33%	26%	7%	33%
Bike Lane with Painted Buffered	6%	19%	45%	30%	75%
Bike Lane	3%	21%	43%	33%	76%
Rural Road w/ Wide Shoulder	7%	16%	42%	35%	77%
Neighborhood Street w/ Low Traffic Volumes	2%	7%	34%	56%	90%
Bike Lane with Painted Buffer and Vertical Objects	4%	4%	21%	72%	92%
Bike Lane w/ Curb Barrier	3%	4%	22%	71%	93%
Multi-Use Trail w/ Separated Walking Area	2%	3%	6%	89%	95%
Multi-Use Trail	2%	1%	14%	82%	96%

Walking Results

Numerous people commented that many areas within Shasta County and the City of Redding felt unsafe and creates a barrier to walking for recreation and for running errands, similar to the reason why some choose not to ride a bicycle. Disconnected sidewalks and long distances between destinations discourage many people from choosing to walk in Redding. Many people noted there are not enough pedestrian accommodations to make people feel safe and comfortable walking, particularly too many large parking lots, high speed roadways, lack of sidewalks, lack of shade, unsafe roadway crossings, and not enough space separating motorists from pedestrians. Destination are too far apart, not connected to existing or non-existent transit service, and there is not enough shade to make it comfortable to walk in the summer.

Many of the write-in other comments stated that crime is a serious issue in Redding, which makes walking around, especially at night, uncomfortable and potentially unsafe.

WikiMap Results

An online map was made available between January 10th and February 28th to allow people to identify specific locations where there are walking and/or bicycling issues, missing connections, locations where bike parking improvements are needed, and where there are strong bicycle and/or pedestrian facilities in place. For each point placed on the map, the user could manually write a comment to describe in detail the issue or opportunity impacting active transportation. Approximately 90 individuals contributed to the online map, placing a total of 464 comments; 65% of these were comments were for the City of Redding.

Table B-2 Number of WikiMap Comments by Comment Type and Location

Location	Bicycling Comments	Walking Comments	Comment "Likes"	Total Comments	% of Total
Anderson	4	1	5	5	1%
City of Shasta Lake	10	0	8	10	2%
Redding	189	101	667	290	65%
Unincorporated County	104	14	155	118	27%
Big Bend/Burney/Fall River Mill Unincorporated Area	13	7	21	20	5%
Total	320	123	856	443	100%

Reoccurring themes from WikiMap input included:

- Debris in roadway/bike facility and poor pavement conditions
- Safe routes and connections to schools, park, and institutions are needed
- Demand for connections to local and regional destinations and to other nearby cities
- More space for people riding a bicycle and walking
- High vehicle speeds contributing to uncomfortable and potentially unsafe pedestrian and bicyclist environments
- Improved crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists at major roadways
- Lack of sidewalk network and pedestrian amenities
- Need for off-street paths connecting to other communities
- Current bike and pedestrian infrastructure and accommodations are not meeting current needs

Summary

A tremendous amount of valuable input was received during the public outreach efforts. Below are common themes from stakeholder meetings, public workshops, the citizen advisory committee, walk audits, and online engagement tools:

- There is strong public demand for safer, more connected, and convenient bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure including on-street and off-street bike facilities, sidewalks, secured bicycle parking, and traffic calming measures.
- When stakeholders were asked what type of bike facilities they prefer and would encourage them to ride a bike, protected bike lanes and off-street trails received the most positive feedback, and would result in the highest increases in people bicycling more often.
- Motor vehicle speeds and dangerous motorist behaviors were reported as contributing factors that make walking and biking uncomfortable and potentially unsafe.
- Debris on the roadway and bike facilities was identified as a barrier to bicycling throughout the region.
- Intersections and corridors near schools, trails, parks, and other popular destinations received the highest number of comments regarding bicycle and walking concerns.
- Improving connections to schools, libraries, open spaces and recreational areas, institutions, and regional assets is high priority for stakeholders.
- Improving walking and biking connections to transit will assist people in reaching destinations that are too far away to solely walk or ride a bicycle to as well as avoid high temperatures in the summer months.
- Perception of high crime rates discourage people from walking and riding a bicycle.
- Safe crossings on major roadways, directness, access to shared use paths, greenspace and shopping was identified as priorities during the public charrette process.
- Positive feedback surrounded the concept of a north/south off-street trail that follows Churn Creek and new trails along the ACID canal, Oregon Gulch, and Jenny Creek.
- Neighborhood streets, while sometimes lacking sidewalks, are generally thought of as pleasant and safe places to walk or bike. However, to access services and use walking and biking as a mode of transportation, connections beyond neighborhoods are critical.

Phase II Community Outreach Summary

The City of Redding, with support from the consultant team and partner agencies, conducted additional on-line and in-person outreach for Phase II of the project. On-line outreach was conducted through the goshasta.org website and an in-person event provided opportunity for the public to comment on elements of the draft plans.

Project Website and On-line Engagement

The goshasta.org website was updated to provide a summary of the draft plans. The website was promoted through social media, cards, print media, outreach to stakeholders, emails to participants generated during the first phase of outreach, and promoted at each of the in-person events.

The following elements of each draft plan were provided online for public comment.


Draft *City of Redding Active Transportation Plan* Elements:

- Existing Bike Facilities in the City of Redding
- Draft Recommended Citywide Bike Facilities for the City of Redding

- Draft Recommended and Existing Bike Facilities for the City of Redding
- Draft Recommended Biking Recommendations for Downtown Redding
- Draft Recommended Citywide Pedestrian Facilities for the City of Redding

In addition to receiving comments on draft plan elements, the Wikimap was available for review and comment. A total of 443 comments (320 bicycling and 123 walking comments) were received on the GoShasta Regional Wikimap (which included opportunities to comment on projects and issues specific to the City of Redding).

Figure B-11 Interactive Wikimaps at goshasta.org



Interactive Wikimaps at goshasta.org indicated proposed bicycle and pedestrian routes and provided a forum for partner agency and public comment.

In-Person Outreach Events

On October 21 and 22, 2017, staff from SRTA, City of Redding, Caltrans, and the Local Government Commission hosted outreach events in Redding. Information booths were setup at the farmer’s market at Redding City Hall on Saturday, October 21 from 7:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m., and at the Sundial Bridge at Turtle Bay Museum on Sunday, October 22 from 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

The Saturday event at farmer’s market was promoted in conjunction with the bicycle valet, helmet give-away and “freedom from training wheels” event organized by Shasta Living Streets. Approximately 100 people visited the information booths on Saturday. In contrast to an evening workshop format, the booth at farmer’s market was effective at engaging a broader demographic of community members: stakeholders at every stage of life, with various ability levels, experiencing homelessness were involved in the conversations.

The Sunday event at the Sundial Bridge at Turtle Bay Museum captured morning walkers, joggers, and cyclists of all ages. Approximately 75 people stopped by the information booths to review draft plan elements, proposed projects, and to submit comments.

Figure B-12 Staff at Information Stations



Methods of Outreach

Leading up to the closing outreach campaign, the consultant team worked with the City of Redding to engage the public in the final phase of the active transportation planning process.

Outreach was focused primarily on steering people toward the project website to submit feedback, and secondarily, encouraging attendance at one of the in-person events. A mix of media outlets was utilized to publicize the final phase of the plan. A media release was distributed via the City of Redding to the region’s print media and newspapers, supported by a social media campaign. Local agencies and organizations were contacted through email encouraging comments on the draft plan elements. Emails were

Figure B-13 Participants and staff at the outreach events



sent to participants in the February workshop series who provided their email contact. Healthy Shasta and Shasta Living Streets helped to promote the events through their networks.

Figure B-14 Staff-conducted Interviews



Staff-conducted interview on October 21-22 with individuals who shared their vision for active transportation.

Network Map Summary

The draft active transportation network for the City of Redding was presented to the public via an online map and public events at the Redding Farmer’s Market and the Sundial Bridge. The public was asked to comment on the proposed network, and in the case of the online map indicate whether they “like” a given recommendation or have a “concern” by placing a point on the map.

A large majority of comments on the online map were supportive of the proposed network or called for a network improvement that was already being proposed, indicating that the user may not have been clear about what was being shown on the map. Still other comments were general in nature (e.g., “make river path safer”, “buffer bike lanes [on all roads].” Many requests for specific facilities were related to Caltrans roadways, which are subject to their separate project development process.

Other Comments

The following comments were received in October 2017 in addition to the comments from the events and Wikimap:

Comment	
1	Designate Space for bikes in all areas of city (too much pavement) especially on Athens St.
2	Crosswalk, yielding needs to be a better enforcement.
3	Bike Registry for public: Required a hidden number for I.D of any stolen bikes.

Comment	
4	Throughout Anderson river park needs improvement for the safety of bikes and pedestrian.
5	This person wants a trail added in Henderson Open Space.
6	A person wants good connectivity for bicyclist.
7	Requiring all roads in Redding for a bike box.
8	Considering a safe direct routes around new Turtle Bay Hotel.
9	From trail behind Hilltop stores (B/w Browning and Dana Drive) to south end of Palisades Trail.
10	He/she wants better parking for bikes in downtown Redding.
11	Situations happening at Buenvetura and Eureka Way. Safety concern for students who are riding or walking to U Prep , Shasta High School or any schools.
12	Consideration for buffered bike lanes for more streets that do not have any.
13	From Downtown Anderson to Anderson River Park (Dog park). Redding is too far?
14	Crossing major roads between neighborhoods like Mary Lake and Ridgeview.
15	For all roads/streets must have the respect and safety for pedestrians and bicyclist.
16	This person wants these specific requirements for the downtown corridor: buffered bike lanes, protected bike lanes and sharrows.
17	Gaps in sidewalks. Fix and connect sidewalks for pedestrians.
18	A safety and connectivity with bus routes at ends of trails
19	A rail loop around City of Redding
20	Rectangular Rapid Flash Beacons
21	ADA- Compliant Sidewalks
22	Modern Islands
23	River Trail Safety for bikes and pedestrians
24	Wants protected Intersection
25	Wrong way bike sign would be great on Placer street
26	Bicycle safety in schools
27	Bike park in Redding by engaging different generations.
28	Downtown pedestrian priority area to promote safety and use. Improving lifestyle.
29	Sacramento River trail in Anderson has not been open since the storm ended.
30	Redding Downtown neighborhoods need to enliven downtown and offer connectivity
31	Priority shared lanes for busy lanes and for the safety of bicyclists.
32	Class 1 bikeway parallel 273 S to Clear Creek Greenway for Placer west to Swasey.
33	On Riverside Center to court st. because of cars being too close.
34	Placer alongside of court st to airpark Drive needs access to shopping and business.
35	Eureka Way needs access to shopping and businesses.
36	On Victor St., where a roundabout is located at, a person suggested to add sidewalks for pedestrians and cyclists, so it could be used by cars, byclists, and pedestrians.
37	Enterprise needs excellent connectivity for bikes.
38	Separating bike and walk lanes.
39	Trails need more separated paths.
40	Recreational Trails on outskirts of city

Comment	
41	Transit past 6:30 p.m. Transit needs more hours because this person has night classes at a college, and this person wants smaller buses.
42	Requiring to connect all trails in community.
43	Connective bike trails to business district and neighborhoods.
44	(City) decided long distance commutes.
45	Churn Creek to 273 needs improvement for safety
46	Cypress needs to extend longer especially when the traffic is on Bechelli Lane intersection, and the one coming from the freeway.
47	All schools should have protected bikeways and pedestrians for kids/teenagers.
48	Better bike/walking facilities. It's better for health and mental fitness.
49	Improve driver behavior. Better Signage (more intuitive).
50	This person wants better transportation projects downtown, so it can be a safer environment to walk, ride a bike, or drive a car.
51	There is not enough intersection to cross.
52	This person wants more trees because it keeps our environment clean and fresh.
53	Anderson to Redding needs more connectivity
54	Connect river trails to more bike paths.
55	Route 273 is hard to cross, and it's hard to reach the button.
56	Old Alturas to north alongside of Boyle need something to get kids to and from school on the bus stop safer.
57	Develop Bike group for people with disabilities.
58	Better bike detection at signals.
59	Maintenance schedule for bikeways. Dedicated resources? If not, need them.
60	Encourage cyclists to use bells to indicate the need to pass pedestrians
61	Some elderly can be hard of hearing, and they need more advanced notice from passing cyclists.
62	Illegal camping in the city of Redding, so homeless population needs access to outlying areas.
63	Discuss social equity with homeless people
64	Bike repair/ Maintenance class
65	More security on trails for safety.
66	Transit stop bike lane bypass
67	Rhonda Rd needs a bike lane or pigment treated shoulder from Gas Point Rd to pleasant hills drive.
68	Separation between motor vehicles and bikes is very important
69	Protected intersection
70	Trail connections- Trunk Line to S.L.C from C.O.R.
71	Would love to see walking/biking lanes with wall buffer. This would encourage more parents to walk with their children.
72	Good Infrastructure, but not safe to walk and bike.
73	Street Light safety and cameras
74	Drivers yelling at my wife and I just for riding in the bike lane
75	Signs say "Bike Route" going out of town (Shasta Lake). Do not believe it!

	Comment
76	Walking connections to open space and public land
77	Choice to be biker and pedestrian as lifestyle.

Appendix B.1. Results from the Online Survey

The online survey was open from January 10 to February 28, 2017. The following is an overview of the results.

Response Statistics


	Count	Percent
Complete	212	75.7
Partial	68	24.3
Disqualified	0	0
Total	280	

In general, how often do you bicycle to get where you need to go, or for exercise?




Value	Percent	Count
Never	15.0%	35
Rarely (a few times a year)	23.2%	54
Occasionally (a few times a month)	30.9%	72
Regularly (a few times a week)	25.3%	59
Always or Almost Always (five or more times a week)	5.6%	13
Total		233

Please tell us how comfortable you feel cycling on the existing cycling network in the Shasta Region. Please select ONE.



Value	Percent	Count
No Way, No How - I am not interested in bicycling at all.	4.8%	11
Interested but Concerned - I prefer low traffic streets or off-street trails. I might ride more if there were more or better bicycle facilities.	61.2%	139
Enthused & Confident - I ride a lot of places, usually in bicycle facilities, but I am comfortable on some roadways without bicycle facilities. I still generally avoid roads that feel dangerous for bicycling.	27.3%	62
Strong & Fearless - I generally ride on all types of roadways and conditions.	6.6%	15
Total		227

If bicycling felt safer and more pleasant, how often would you want to bicycle?



Value	Percent	Count
Never	3.9%	9
Rarely (a few times a year)	3.9%	9
Occasionally (a few times a month)	25.5%	59
Regularly (a few times a week)	40.3%	93
Always or Almost Always (five or more times a week)	26.4%	61
Total		231


Following is a list of common reasons why people do not bicycle. How important are each of these to your decision to bicycle to get somewhere, like to a job or to run errands?

	This is not a reason why I don't bike (or this situation does not apply)	Sometimes I do not bike for this reason	This is a big reason why I don't bike	Don't know
	Count	Count	Count	Count
The area feels unsafe due to crime.	112	60	50	3
There are not many destinations (grocery stores, jobs, shops, schools, parks, bus stops) near my home.	120	52	50	1
I don't own a bicycle.	204	3	13	2
I cannot safely carry packages, children, etc.	93	95	36	1
I don't enjoy riding a bicycle or it is difficult for me.	194	14	11	2
There is no place to safely lock my bicycle.	92	79	47	3
In winter, bicycling feels unsafe due to snow and ice.	114	57	50	1
I don't know anyone else who rides a bicycle.	198	11	10	3
I'm physically unable to ride a bicycle.	204	10	7	1
I don't want to arrive at my destination sweaty or wet.	81	108	33	1
There are too many hills on streets I would take.	148	65	10	2
Destinations are too far to ride a bicycle and bus service is nonexistent or inconvenient.	92	77	50	4

Following is a list of common traffic-related reasons that discourage people from bicycling. How important are each of these to your decision to ride a bicycle in the Shasta Region?


	This is not a reason why I don't bike (or this situation does not apply)	Sometimes I do not bike for this reason	This is a big reason why I don't bike	I don't know
	Count	Count	Count	Count
Motor vehicle drivers go too fast.	63	80	80	1
Motor vehicle drivers are inconsiderate or inattentive.	42	85	96	2
The existing bicycle facilities do not go where I need them to go.	71	82	63	8
The existing bicycle facilities do not feel safe.	74	80	63	8
The existing bicycle facilities are not maintained properly.	112	72	27	12

Where do you ride your bike most of the time? (If you don't ride, where do you spend most of your time?) You may check multiple options.




Value	Percent	Count
Rural Shasta County	49.8%	111
Shasta Lake	9.4%	21
Anderson	9.0%	20
Redding	70.0%	156
Other - Write In	14.8%	33

What type of facility do you usually ride on? (Choose any that apply).




Value	Percent	Count
Neighborhood streets	64.6%	126
Major streets sharing lane with cars	40.5%	79
Major streets with bike lanes	48.2%	94
On sidewalks	17.4%	34
Unpaved multi-use paths/trails	48.7%	95
Paved multi-use paths/trails	71.8%	140
Parks	27.7%	54
Other - Write In	5.6%	11

Bike Lane: How comfortable would you feel biking here?




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	32.1%	70
Somewhat comfortable	43.6%	95
Somewhat uncomfortable	20.6%	45
Very uncomfortable	3.7%	8
Total		218

**Multi-Use Trail with Separated Walking Area:
How comfortable would you feel biking here?**




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	88.6%	195
Somewhat comfortable	6.8%	15
Somewhat uncomfortable	2.7%	6
Very uncomfortable	1.8%	4
Total		220

Sharing a Lane with Motor Vehicles: How comfortable would you feel biking here?




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	7.2%	16
Somewhat comfortable	27.1%	60
Somewhat uncomfortable	32.1%	71
Very uncomfortable	33.5%	74
Total		221

**Bike Lane with Painted Buffer Next to Vehicle Lane:
How comfortable would you feel biking here?**




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	29.5%	65
Somewhat comfortable	45.5%	100
Somewhat uncomfortable	19.1%	42
Very uncomfortable	5.9%	13
Total		220

**Bike Lane with Painted Buffer and Vertical Objects:
How comfortable would you feel biking here?**




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	70.5%	155
Somewhat comfortable	21.4%	47
Somewhat uncomfortable	4.5%	10
Very uncomfortable	3.6%	8
Total		220

**Neighborhood Street with Low Traffic Volume and Slower Speeds:
How comfortable would you feel biking here?**




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	56.4%	123
Somewhat comfortable	33.9%	74
Somewhat uncomfortable	6.9%	15
Very uncomfortable	2.8%	6
Total		218

**Bike Lane with Curb Barrier Next to Vehicle Lane:
How comfortable would you feel biking here?**




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	69.7%	152
Somewhat comfortable	23.9%	52
Somewhat uncomfortable	3.7%	8
Very uncomfortable	2.8%	6
Total		218

Multi-Use Trail: How comfortable would you feel biking here?




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	81.0%	179
Somewhat comfortable	14.9%	33
Somewhat uncomfortable	1.4%	3
Very uncomfortable	2.7%	6
Total		221

Rural Road, Little or No Shoulder: How comfortable would you feel biking here?




Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	5.9%	13
Somewhat comfortable	14.0%	31
Somewhat uncomfortable	35.7%	79
Very uncomfortable	44.3%	98
Total		221

Rural Road with Wide Shoulder: How comfortable would you feel biking here?



Value	Percent	Count
Very comfortable	34.7%	76
Somewhat comfortable	41.1%	90
Somewhat uncomfortable	17.8%	39
Very uncomfortable	6.4%	14
Total		219

If walking felt safer and more pleasant, how often would you want to walk?



Value	Percent	Count
Never or Almost Never (less than once a week)	5.0%	11
Occasionally (once or twice a week)	26.0%	57
Usually (three to four times a week)	39.3%	86
Always or Almost Always (five or more times a week)	29.7%	65
Total		219


Following is a list of common reasons that discourage people from walking. How important are each of these to your decision to walk?

	This is not a reason why I don't walk (or this situation does not apply)	Sometimes I do not walk for this reason	This is a big reason why I don't walk	I don't know
	Count	Count	Count	Count
The area feels unsafe due to crime.	83	74	57	0
There are not many destinations (grocery stores, jobs, shops, schools, parks, bus stops) near my home.	82	74	58	0
I don't have anyone to walk with me.	153	46	14	0
I don't enjoy walking or it is difficult for me.	194	15	3	0
In winter, the sidewalks feel unsafe due to snow and ice.	159	34	20	0
I'm physically unable to walk.	198	10	3	1
In summer, walking is too hot because there is not enough shade.	54	93	68	0
I don't want to arrive at my destination sweaty or wet.	114	78	19	0
Destinations are too far to walk and bus service is nonexistent or inconvenient.	64	71	75	1

Following is a list of common traffic-related reasons that discourage people from walking. How important are each of these to your decision to walk?


	This is not a reason why I don't walk (or this situation does not apply)	Sometimes I do not walk for this reason	This is a big reason why I don't walk	I don't know
	Count	Count	Count	Count
The sidewalks are too close to the road.	155	44	13	1
Cars are going too fast.	106	70	36	1
Not enough places to cross the street safely.	108	72	32	0
I have to wait too long to cross the street.	154	39	19	1
Crossing the street feels too dangerous.	119	72	21	0
The existing sidewalks are not maintained properly.	134	52	25	2
There are no sidewalks where I want to walk.	92	62	60	0

How did you find out about this survey?




Value	Percent	Count
Website	9.2%	20
Social media	29.5%	64
I was asked to take the survey	35.0%	76
Other - Write In	26.3%	57
Total		217

Your gender?




Value	Percent	Count
Male	43.3%	94
Female	55.3%	120
Prefer not to answer	1.4%	3
Total		217

Your age?




Value	Percent	Count
18-24	0.9%	2
25-30	7.8%	17
31-40	21.7%	47
41-50	24.4%	53
51-64	28.1%	61
65 and over	17.1%	37
Total		217

What is your race?




Value	Percent	Count
American Indian/Native American	2.8%	6
Asian	0.9%	2
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0.9%	2
White (non-Hispanic)	81.6%	177
Biracial/Multiracial	2.8%	6
Other - Write In	2.3%	5
Prefer not to answer	8.8%	19
Total		217

What is your ethnicity?




Value	Percent	Count
Hispanic or Latino	3.0%	6
Not Hispanic or Latino	97.0%	194
Total		200

What is the ZIP code where you live?



Count	Response
78	96001
24	96002
48	96003
10	96007
1	96008
1	96011
17	96013
1	96016
10	96019
6	96022
1	96025
5	96028
1	96040
2	96056
1	96065
1	96069
3	96073
2	96087
2	96088
1	96130

Do you own a car?



Value	Percent	Count
Yes	98.6%	214
No	1.4%	3
Total		217

Appendix B.2. WikiMap Comment Locations

The following maps are the outputs from the City of Redding mapping exercise used to collect public input on bicycle and pedestrian issues and opportunities.

Figure B-15 All Outreach Comments






Figure B-16 Biking-Related Outreach Comments



Biking-Related Outreach Comments
 City of Redding

Figure B-17 Walking-Related Outreach Comments



Appendix C. Programmatic Support Background

The Appendix provides background information for the programs discussed in Chapter 6, including current initiatives in the city and examples from other communities and programs.

Education

Safety Messaging and Bicycle Ambassadors

Example

The Salt Lake County (SLCo) Bicycle Ambassador Program team provides services to the 17 municipalities and unincorporated areas within Salt Lake County, Utah. The ambassadors are volunteers that are passionate about educating residents, promoting safe bicycle travel, and creating a healthy shared-use culture and mutual respect between all roadway users. They provide a variety of services, including bike mentorship, community cycling workshops, safe cycling rewards, organized rides, commuter pit stops, and bike lane stewardship.¹

Bike Theft Prevention Programs

Example

The Chicago Department of Transportation has a bike parking program that oversees citywide installation of bike racks within the public right-of-way, coordinates with transit providers to ensure there is sufficient bike parking, reviews construction activities to ensure bike racks are replaced if they need to be temporarily removed, and implements citywide bike rack standards. Additionally, the bike parking program manager often coordinates with the City of Chicago's Bike Program to ensure bike racks are available along bikeways. The City of Chicago has a web-based application to allow the public to request a bike racks; the website includes a map with existing bike racks, pending bike rack requests, approved requests, and denied requests with a description explaining why the request was denied.

Education on Proper Locking

Example

The City of Calgary in Alberta, Canada, and Bike Calgary, a local bike advocacy organization, teamed up to launch a bike locking educational program called "Save the Bikes." During a "Save the Bikes" event, volunteers placed stickers on public bike racks; the stickers illustrated three bike locking techniques which were rated from good to best. The event was a low-cost way to share information about bike locking methods, generate awareness, and

Bicycle Registration Program

Example

The City of Vancouver, BC experienced a reduction in bike theft by 35% over the course of twelve months and attributed the decline to their partnership with Project 529, education campaigns, and enforcement efforts. The collaborative relationship between Project 529, the City of Vancouver, law enforcement, bike shops, and the public led to nearly 900 fewer bike being reported stolen in just one year.

¹ More information on SLCo's Ambassador Program can be found at <http://slco.org/active-transportation/bicycle-ambassador-program/>.

Anti-Bike Theft Signage

Examples

The Singapore Police Force places letter board signs in areas that are experiencing high rates of bike thefts. Some signs report the total number of thefts in that area during the previous year while others state that a bike theft has occurred at that location. The sign also provides contact information for reporting a stolen bike, techniques to reduce the likelihood of having one's bike stolen, and a graphic illustrating the ineffectiveness of a cable lock²

Newcastle University, in England, installed signs at three study locations with high rates of bicycle theft to evaluate the effects of anti-bike theft signage.³ Bicycle thefts at the three study locations were compared to the reported thefts at locations. For a twelve-month period, reported bike thefts at the locations with signage were reduced by 62 percent when compared to the prior period. At locations without signage, the number of reported bicycle thefts increased by 65 percent. The results suggest that the intervention was effective but may have displaced the offenses to locations that did not have the anti-theft signage. While the use of signage has yet to be widely adopted in the United States, this intervention may be worth considering in "hot spot" locations for bike thefts given the low costs of signage.

Bait Bike Program

Example

The Sacramento Police Department (Sac PD) started deploying bait bikes equipped with GPS tracking equipment in late 2013. There are about 20 bikes in the program that were purchased by business groups who were concerned about local safety. The bikes are placed in locations throughout the city that have high rates of bicycle thefts, vehicle break-ins, or residential burglaries.⁴ Sac PD deployed the bait bikes 168 times in 2015, resulting in 60 arrests; Fifty-nine of those arrested were repeat offenders.⁵

Encouragement

Bike Friendly Businesses

Example

The Active Transportation Alliance (ATA) in Chicago, Illinois received a \$25,000 grant in 2013 from People for Bikes to help launch a new Bike Friendly Business program. The program advertises bike friendly businesses on the ATA's website using an interactive map and provides businesses with signage to promote bikes. The ATA also recruits business champions who can play an important role in advocating for better bike facilities, post petitions, and coordinate with other businesses around bike issues.

Employer/Employee Incentives (for walking, biking, and taking transit)

Example

A Bicycle-Friendly Business Program is sponsored by Shasta Living Streets, Healthy Shasta, and the Redding Chamber of Commerce. The program began as the "Bicycle-Friendly Employer Program" and focuses on encouraging employers to support their employees in bicycling to work. In 2016, the name of

² <https://www.police.gov.sg/~media/spf/images/crimeposter/bicycle%20theft.jpg>

³ <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article/file?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0051738&type=printable>

⁴ <http://www.sacbee.com/news/local/crime/article73651717.html>

⁵ <http://sacbike.org/south-sac-residents-question-bait-bike-program/>

the program changed to “Bicycle-Friendly Business Program, and the focus of the program expanded to also consider how businesses also support customers, visitors, and a bicycling culture in the community.

Each year, the program offers annual awards to local bicycle-friendly businesses. Any business, organization, public entity or worksite within Shasta County is eligible to be nominated, and the winners are determined by a committee with representatives from several organizations who reference the League of American Bicyclist’s Bicycle Friendly Business criteria. Winners receive recognition through free marketing, are honored at the Bicycle Friendly Business celebration, are awarded a complimentary bicycle rack of their choice and a bicycle friendly banner, and receive a Shasta Living Street Membership.

End of Trip Facilities

Example

The Houston-Galveston Area Council (HGAC), the region’s MPO, developed *End-of-Trip Facilities: A Planning Guide for the Houston-Galveston Region*.⁶ This guide is directed at educating employers to increase the number of employers providing end of trip facilities. The guide outlines the benefits of end of trip facilities and identifies different types of amenities that improve bike parking, showers and changing facilities, and repair tools. For each type of amenity, the guide provides suggested locations, cost estimates, level of security, design considerations, and case studies.

Open Street Events/Community Rides

Example

Shasta Living Streets has hosted open street events since 2011 in the City of Redding. Shasta Living Streets markets the event as a “free-form parade where everyone participates and it’s not just for bicycles!” The event encourages people to view their city from a different perspective and learn about local businesses and attractions they may not have previously known. Cities and areas in Shasta region create similar events to contribute to a fun and inviting culture to encourage people to choose an active mode of transportation.

Wayfinding

Example

The City of Berkeley has a wayfinding system to help residents and visitors navigate their bicycle boulevard network. The system uses seven types of signs to ensure that those using the network know where they are, know what’s nearby, and how to get to their destination. The consistency throughout the network helps to not only inform users about where the network is, but also creates a recognizable brand that users can look for. This branding is an important part of any network, but especially a network that is trying to attract new users. Other examples of bicycle wayfinding in the U.S. can be viewed at <https://nacto.org/treatment/bike-route-way-finding-signage-and-markings-system/>.

Land Use Policies

Example

While Smart Growth policies have been discussed and adopted by a variety of cities over the last decades, there’s limited research that can directly relate the policies to a reduction of VMT or increases in walking and biking. That said, research has shown that residents that would like to walk or bike more will select an area where they can walk or bike more. In other words, the link between travel behavior and

⁶ <https://www.h-gac.com/community/livablecenters/publications/End-of-Trip-Facilities11-02-2015.pdf>

neighborhood type or land use are largely explained by the self-selection of residents with certain attitudes that seek out certain types of land use.⁷

Development Plans

Example

The City of Vancouver developed a flexible parking requirement approach to incentivize developing less parking, while ensuring that the surrounding transportation system and amenities still meet the needs of residents. City staff have created a Sustainable Transportation Credit Program, loosely based on the LEED Green Building rating system, that offers credits for reducing the number of parking stalls, providing parking spaces for carshare vehicles, and providing annual transit passes to building occupants.

Access to Transit

Example

Atlanta, GA has worked to target investments towards efforts that connect people to transit. With finite resources devoted to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, the city has focused on transit as their primary active transportation “destination.” Their Cycle Atlanta Study 1.0 prioritized corridors that linked to multimodal transit hubs within the BeltLine, and Cycle Atlanta 2.0 will focus on connectivity to transit stations outside of the BeltLine.

Enforcement

Drivers Failing to Yield the Right-of-Way

Example

St. Paul, Minnesota developed the “Stop for Me” campaign which is aimed at reducing pedestrian crashes by issuing citations to motorists who fail to yield to pedestrians at marked and unmarked crosswalks. During the campaign, volunteers attempted to cross at crosswalks throughout St. Paul; 34 crosswalks were included in the campaign. If motorists did not stop within 193 feet, the required distance for motorists to safely stop at 40 mph, the motorist was issued a ticket.

Speed

Examples

The Redding Police Department has a speed-monitoring awareness radar tool, called a “smart trailer,” which is used to control chronic speeding problems without the need of a law enforcement officer to be present. The smart trailer shows a motorist’s speed on an oversized display and is placed at locations with high rates of speed limit infractions, or upon request and availability.

Traffic Control Compliance

Example

The Chicago Department of Transportation’s Bicycle Ambassadors work with the Police Department to host enforcement campaigns at high-crash locations. The purpose of these campaigns is to target dangerous behaviors, often at intersections with stop signs or traffic signals. Warnings are issued all who fail to obey the traffic control devices. In 2016, the Bicycle Ambassadors conducted 66 campaigns,

⁷ Handy, Susan (2005). *Smart growth and the transportation-land use connection: What does the research tell us?* International Regional Science Review, Vol 28, No. 2, pp. 146-167.

issued 850 warnings to bicyclists, and 700 warnings to motorists. After the campaign, the Police Department continues to issue citations to those who do not comply with traffic control regulations.

More locally, the Injury Prevention Coalition of Shasta County is currently working with high schools to provide events and education around discouraging distracted driving and driving under the influence.

Rewarding Good Behavior

Example

The Naperville, Illinois, Police Department hosts an annual campaign during which police officers issue “ice cream” citations to children who are demonstrating safe bicycle riding behaviors. These “ice cream” citations are coupons that can be redeemed for a free ice cream cone from McDonald’s. From 2015 to 2017, the Naperville Police Department has issued between 1,000 and 4,000 citations each year.

Similar “re-enforcement” campaigns were conducted by the Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) who partnered with volunteers from the Cascade Bicycle Club. At a new two-way protected bike lane in downtown Seattle, SDOT staff and volunteers “issued” Starbucks’ gift cards to motorists and bicyclists who obeyed the new bicycle traffic signals and who parked, loaded, and unloaded goods correctly.

Enforcement Methods

Example

In Three Rivers Park, Minnesota, a trail patrol was created by the Police Department after crashes (between motorists and bicyclists/pedestrians, and between bicyclists and pedestrians) occurred at many trail and roadway intersections throughout the trail system and a rise in petty crime had occurred.⁸ The Trail Patrol focuses on education and awareness campaigns and law enforcement. Two fulltime sworn officers and three non-sworn park service officers patrol the trails. The team attends bike and pedestrian-related events to share information about their team and to and develop a relationship with the community.

Evaluation

Example

The Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT) has 12 permanent automated bicycle counters on neighborhood greenways, multi-use trails, and several bridges. The counters provide data that are compared to 2014 baseline counts to assess past performance and evaluate progress towards the City’s goal of quadrupling ridership by 2030. Three of the counters automatically upload data once a day, and updates SDOT’s website display with the results in daily, weekly, monthly, and annual totals. The other counters upload data once a month.

⁸ <http://ipmba.org/blog/comments/trail-patrol-a-proactive-approach-to-public-safety>

Appendix D. Network Development, Prioritization, and Planned Project Lists

Network Development Methodology

The planned pedestrian and bicycle networks were developed through an iterative process, first using a number of datasets (e.g., a GIS-based gap analysis, a level of traffic stress analysis, posted speed data, crash data, and field and aerial reviews). Then, the city reviewed the draft planned pedestrian and bicycle networks to ensure connections to key existing and planned destinations (e.g., schools, colleges, shopping centers, employment centers, commercial/civic uses, parks, and transit). Lastly, the city assessed the feasibility of implementing different facility types, referencing city design/roadway standards and bikeway design manuals/guidance.

Prioritization Methodology

Implementing the bike and pedestrian projects will require funding from multiple sources and coordination with various agencies. Some projects may be more appropriate for certain funding sources and/or better meet the needs of agencies and their constituents. This section presents the method used to prioritize projects in order to better understand how a project may align with funding sources and stakeholder needs.

Project Scoring

Project scoring assessed safety, demand, and equity; public input; and network connectivity. The method was created so that it could be rerun as newer data becomes available. Scoring and measures used can be viewed in Table D-1.

- **Safety, demand, and equity.** First, bicycle and pedestrian heatmaps using safety, demand, and equity factors were generated. The heatmaps were developed in GIS by overlaying weighted buffers at different distance bands for each criterion. The buffers were merged together and the individual criteria scores were summed to create a combined safety, demand, and equity score. This score was then applied to the individual segments of the planned networks.

The individual project segments were then merged into larger project segments using the heatmap score, existing bikeway network, roadway network, and the recommended bike facility types as breaks in the network. The average heatmap score is applied to each project segment during the merge creating a preliminary score.

- **Public Input.** Next, public input received during the WikiMap exercise was incorporated into the scoring by “awarding” points if the project received supportive comments.
- **Network Connectivity.** Lastly, a connectivity analysis was completed to assign additional points to projects that improve bikeway network connectivity. The connectivity score was calculated using GIS to count the number of connections between the proposed project and existing and recommended bikeways. A larger number of connections resulted in a higher connectivity score. In addition, projects that would close a network gap between two existing bike facilities on the

same street were given an additional 5 points, and projects that directly connect to the Sacramento River Trail were given 5 points due to the trail's regional popularity.

The final score was calculated by summing the safety, demand, and equity; public input; and network connectivity scores (if applicable – network connectivity scores were applied only to bikeway recommendations). The result of the scoring for bike, pedestrian, and spot recommendations can be viewed on maps 1-2 and the prioritized projects can be viewed tables D2-D3.

Other Factors

In addition to project scoring, projects were assessed for their ability to garner funding from multiple sources, as well as their ability to meet existing needs. Projects with an ease of implementation (e.g., through retrofitting existing streets with minimal design effort and impacts to other travel modes) were favorably considered.

Table D-1: City of Redding Project Scoring


Factor	Criteria	Measure	Points
Safety			Total Points Possible
	Crash analysis¹	Tier 1 - High concentration	20
		Tier 2 - Medium to high concentration	10
		Tier 3 - Medium concentration	5
	Level of traffic stress (LTS)²	LTS 4	20
		LTS 3	10
Demand			Total Points Possible
	Parks	Within 1/2 mile	10
		Within 1 mile	5
	Transit stops	Within 1/4 mile from a transit center	10
		Within 1/4 mile from a bus stop	5
	School	Within 1/4 mile	10
		Within 1/4-1/2 mile	5
		Within 1/2-3/4 mile	2
	Population	Within a high population density Census Block Group	10
Equity			Total Points Possible
	Low Resource Communities³	Within a Low Resource Community	20
WikiMap Feedback			Total Points Possible
	Supporting comments	Directly refers to a proposed project	10
Connectivity (bike projects only)			Total Points Possible
	Connects with existing bike facility	Connects with five or more existing bike facilities	15
		Connects with any existing bike facilities	10
	Connects with 2 or more proposed bike recommendations	Connects with two or more City of Redding ATP bike recommendations	5
	Closes a network gap	Closes a gap between two existing bike facilities on the same street	5
	Connects to Sacramento River Trail	Directly connects to the Sacramento River Trail	5
			GRAND TOTAL
			145

¹ Crashes were weighted based on the severity of the most severe injury resulting from the crash. Fatal crashes receive 10 points, serious injuries receive 5 points, minor or possible injury crashes receive 3 points, and no injuries or property damage only receive 1 point. Four tiers are classified using natural breaks with the lowest tier being removed from the analysis.


² A Level of Traffic Stress Analysis (See Appendix A) was conducted. Roads determined to have a level of traffic stress of 3 or 4 are generally considered to be uncomfortable for less experienced bicyclists due to traffic speeds, volumes and existing bicycle facilities (or lack of). These roads were included in the prioritization analysis because they are good candidates for improvements that would make them more safe and comfortable for a larger segment of the population.

³ A Low Resource Community is defined in SRTA's 2015 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Low Resource Communities are identified in the Disadvantaged Communities Analysis that was conducted as part of the 2015 RTP. The analysis uses easy to follow socio-economic American Community Survey Census data at the Census Block Group level (13 datasets/identifiers) to identify Low Resource Communities. Census Block Groups with 5 or more identifiers are considered Low Resource Communities.

Map 1: City of Redding Prioritized Planned Bikeway Network



Map 2: City of Redding Prioritized Planned Pedestrian Network



Tables D.2 Priority Projects

Redding																				
Bicycle																				
Street Name	From Street	To Street	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Safety		Connectivity				Demand					Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band
					Level of Traffic Stress	Bike Crash Density	Connects to Proposed Facilities	Closes Network Gap	Connects to Existing Facility	Connects to Sac River Trail	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Population	Disad-vantaged Community	Com-munity			
TRINITY ST	CENTER ST	CONTINENTAL ST	Separated Bike Lane	0.43	2.5	16.2	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	4.8	8.8	5.6	18.8	0.0	80.3	\$59,894.92	2018-2025
VICTOR AVE	BRAMBLE PL	OLD ALTURAS RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.76	10.0	5.2	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	2.9	6.5	8.1	7.3	13.8	0.0	73.8	\$112,748.44	2018-2025
SHASTA ST; WILLIS ST; PLEASANT ST; SOUTH ST	SOUTH ST/SAN FRANCISCO ST	SHASTA ST/ COURT ST	Bike Boule- vard	1.46	2.4	7.6	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.4	6.9	8.8	7.0	5.6	17.3	0.0	71.0	\$585,817.80	2018-2025
CONTINENTAL ST	BUTTE ST	TRINITY ST	Separated Bike Lane	0.31	3.7	15.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	4.7	7.6	6.3	12.6	0.0	71.0	\$43,526.38	2018-2025
VICTOR AVE	BRAMBLE PL	OLD ARTURAS RD	Shared-Use Path	1.75	7.4	5.2	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	6.4	8.1	6.7	14.4	0.0	66.2	\$1,549,704.06	2018-2025
SHASTA VIEW DR	SATURN SKWY	GOODWATER AVE	Buffered Bike Lane	1.09	7.0	0.9	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	3.5	6.5	10.0	15.6	0.0	65.8	\$69,505.53	2018-2025
BUTTE ST	CONTINENTAL ST	SUNDIAL BRIDGE DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.39	10.0	12.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	6.2	6.5	1.5	3.1	0.0	62.0	\$25,223.99	2018-2025
RAILROAD AVE	BUENAVENTURA BLVD	SOUTH ST	Shared-Use Path	1.80	8.1	9.1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	7.3	4.7	8.4	5.9	11.9	0.0	60.9	\$1,599,192.21	2018-2025
OFF-STREET (TURTLE BAY TO DOWNTOWN TRAIL)	TURTLE BAY	CONTINENTAL ST	Shared-Use Path	0.86	6.0	9.6	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	8.3	5.0	6.3	1.3	2.7	0.0	59.2	\$759,721.83	2018-2025
OFF-STREET (SHASTA VIEW DR)	SATURN WAY	GOODWATER AVE	Shared-Use Path	1.09	5.4	1.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	3.2	7.0	10.0	9.7	0.0	57.6	\$968,859.13	2018-2025
PARK MARINA DR	SUNDIAL BRIDGE DR	E CYPRESS AVE	Shared-Use Path	1.35	6.4	3.5	5.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	0.0	7.8	4.7	7.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	55.0	\$1,202,390.04	2018-2025
PARK MARINA DR	SUNDIAL BRIDGE DR	PARKVIEW AVE	Buffered Bike Lane	1.40	6.3	4.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	8.1	4.1	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.3	\$89,912.17	2018-2025
SOUTH ST	EAST ST	PARK MARINA DR	Bike Boule- vard	0.94	1.1	9.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	7.3	6.4	2.1	4.3	0.0	50.2	\$374,306.22	2018-2025
HAWLEY RD; CHURN CREEK RD	HAWLEY RD/ COLLYER DR	CHURN CREEK RD/PALACIO DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.82	10.0	1.7	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.7	8.5	3.8	3.1	0.0	49.7	\$52,565.13	2018-2025
COLLYER DR	POISON OAK LN	HAWLEY RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.10	10.0	0.5	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	7.7	0.0	7.3	0.0	43.0	\$70,190.49	2018-2025
Redding Bicycle Subtotal																		\$7,563,558		
Pedestrian																				
Street Name	From Street	To Street	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Safety		Demand				Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band					
					Pedestrian Crash Density	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Disadvantaged Community	Community									
RAILROAD AVE	SOUTH ST	BUENAVENTURA BLVD	Sidewalk	3.53	15.13	0.79	7.17	5.76	4.93		7.50	16.05	57.34	\$2,001,463.13	2018-2025					
RAILROAD AVE (EAST SIDE)	SOUTH ST	BUENAVENTURA BLVD	Shared use path	0.73	13.59	0.51	7.24	4.60	4.87		5.64	11.28	47.74	\$645,934.08	2018-2025					
SHASTA VIEW DR	SATURN SKWY	GOODWATER AVE	Sidewalk	2.32	2.32	0.00	7.32	3.54	4.15		10.00	15.61	42.93	\$1,317,989.40	2018-2025					
VICTOR AVE (WEST SIDE)	BRAMBLE PL	OLD ALTURAS RD	Shared use path	1.76	5.00	0.00	3.82	6.55	5.00		7.06	14.51	41.94	\$1,563,528.22	2018-2025					
SHASTA VIEW DR (EAST SIDE)	SATURN SKWY	GOODWATER AVE	Shared use path	1.16	3.33	0.00	8.10	4.00	4.29		10.00	11.43	41.14	\$1,031,623.78	2018-2025					
VICTOR AVE	BRAMBLE PL	OLD ALTURAS RD	Sidewalk	3.52	5.00	0.00	2.88	6.50	5.00		7.31	13.85	40.54	\$1,997,543.74	2018-2025					
OLD ALTURAS RD (NORTH SIDE)	BROWNING ST	VICTOR AVE	Shared use path	0.18	3.00	0.00	0.00	10.00	5.00		10.00	0.00	28.00	\$155,386.01	2018-2025					
PARK MARINA DR (EAST SIDE)	SUNDIAL BRIDGE DR	E. CYPRESS AVE	Shared use path	1.24	1.21	0.00	8.28	4.07	4.83		0.00	0.00	18.38	\$1,096,895.83	2018-2025					
PARK MARINA DR	SUNDIAL BRIDGE DR	E. CYPRESS AVE	Sidewalk	2.42	1.05	0.00	7.56	4.63	4.88		0.00	0.00	18.12	\$1,373,109.13	2018-2025					
Redding Pedestrian Subtotal													\$11,183,473							
Redding Subtotal													\$18,747,031							

Redding																				
Bicycle																				
Street Name	From Street	To Street	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Safety		Connectivity				Demand					Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band
					Level of Traffic Stress	Bike Crash Density	Connects to Proposed Facilities	Closes Network Gap	Connects to Existing Facility	Connects to Sac River Trail	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Population	Disad-vantaged Community	Com-unity			
CALIFORNIA ST	DIVISION ST	YUBA ST	Separated Bike Lane	0.27	6.0	17.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	7.0	6.0	10.0	20.0	10.0	116.5	\$37,437.08	2026-2040
CALIFORNIA ST	YUBA ST	PLACER ST	Separated Bike Lane	0.07	5.0	17.5	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.7	10.0	20.0	10.0	114.2	\$10,043.32	2026-2040
PINE ST	S MARKET ST	TRINITY ST	Subject to Caltrans Process Buffered Bike Lane	1.01	6.1	20.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	2.2	9.6	9.1	7.8	8.7	17.4	10.0	110.9	\$64,624.67	2026-2040
YUBA ST	COURT ST	CALIFORNIA ST	Bike Route	0.20	5.0	20.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	8.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	108.0	\$7,705.73	2026-2040
SOUTH ST	COURT ST	EAST ST	Bike Lane	0.41	6.3	20.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	5.3	9.0	10.0	7.3	9.3	18.7	0.0	106.0	\$16,301.38	2026-2040
YUBA ST	CALIFORNIA AVE	LIBERTY ST	Separated Bike Lane	0.36	3.2	20.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	8.2	8.9	8.6	9.3	18.6	0.0	101.8	\$50,461.63	2026-2040
PLACER ST	PLEASANT ST	COURT ST	Buffered Bike Lane	0.95	9.7	11.1	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	1.7	8.0	9.3	4.3	7.4	20.0	10.0	101.5	\$60,578.99	2026-2040
TEHAMA ST	WEST ST	CALIFORNIA ST	Bike Route	0.28	3.3	20.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	7.8	7.2	9.4	8.3	10.0	20.0	0.0	101.1	\$10,942.18	2026-2040
CALIFORNIA ST; GOLD ST; S MARKET ST	S MARKET ST/W. CYPRESS AVE	CALIFORNIA ST/ PLACER ST	Buffered Bike Lane	0.60	7.3	20.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	1.5	9.6	10.0	7.3	10.0	20.0	0.0	100.8	\$38,293.02	2026-2040
COURT ST; N COURT ST	COURT ST/SOUTH ST	N COURT ST/ BENTON DR	Bike Lane	0.82	7.3	18.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	5.0	7.9	9.6	8.4	7.1	20.0	0.0	98.5	\$32,375.91	2026-2040
CENTER ST; RIVER-SIDE DR; DIVISION ST; CALIFORNIA ST	BENTON DR/N COURT ST	PLACER ST	Separated Bike Lane	0.42	4.0	17.5	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	3.3	8.7	5.0	6.0	4.0	20.0	10.0	98.5	\$58,774.81	2026-2040
EAST ST	PLACER ST	TRINITY ST	Bike Lane	0.46	6.6	19.3	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.7	7.6	9.2	10.0	20.0	0.0	96.4	\$17,988.78	2026-2040
CHURN CREEK RD	E CYPRESS AVE	HARTNELL AVE	Buffered Bike Lane	0.50	8.6	9.9	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	8.3	9.4	8.9	20.0	0.0	92.7	\$31,919.60	2026-2040
EAST ST	PINE ST	LOCUST ST	Bike Lane	0.09	5.0	20.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	7.5	5.0	10.0	10.0	92.5	\$3,576.07	2026-2040
S MARKET ST	QUARTZ HILL RD	TRINITY ST	Bike Lane	0.47	10.0	7.1	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	4.4	6.9	3.8	20.0	10.0	92.2	\$18,424.71	2026-2040
SOUTH ST	WEST ST	COURT ST	Bike Boulevard	0.08	5.0	12.9	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	10.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	91.6	\$33,133.60	2026-2040
E CYPRESS AVE	CHURN CREEK RD	HARTNELL AVE/ HEMSTED DR	Bike Lane	0.87	8.9	13.8	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	10.0	8.7	5.0	20.0	0.0	90.6	\$34,354.78	2026-2040
HARTNELL AVE	E CYPRESS AVE	CHURN CREEK RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.26	6.4	9.8	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	9.4	7.9	9.4	20.0	0.0	89.8	\$80,612.12	2026-2040
BUTTE ST; LIBERTY ST	LIBERTY ST/YUBA ST	BUTTE ST/CONTI-NENTAL ST	Separated Bike Lane	0.14	5.0	20.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	6.9	9.4	8.8	17.5	0.0	89.4	\$19,484.10	2026-2040
CONTINENTAL ST	SOUTH ST	BUTTE ST	Bike Boulevard	0.32	2.1	20.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	8.4	7.9	5.3	10.5	10.0	89.2	\$126,183.42	2026-2040
HARTNELL AVE	CHURN CREEK RD	VICTOR AVE	Buffered Bike Lane	0.72	9.4	9.8	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	6.8	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	88.5	\$46,032.00	2026-2040
S MARKET ST	SOUTH ST	PLACER ST	Bike Route	0.11	3.8	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	10.0	5.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	86.3	\$4,442.02	2026-2040
WEST ST; GOLD ST; AIRPARK DR	WEST ST/EUREKA WAY	AIRPARK DR/ PLACER ST	Bike Boulevard	1.23	3.0	12.7	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.0	7.3	9.7	6.4	8.6	20.0	0.0	84.7	\$490,624.46	2026-2040
E CYPRESS AVE	VICTOR AVE	ALFREDA WAY	Buffered Bike Lane	0.47	10.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	7.3	5.5	5.5	20.0	0.0	82.3	\$29,913.04	2026-2040
N MARKET ST	SULPHUR CREEK RD	BENTON DR	Bike Lane	0.09	10.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	7.5	8.8	0.0	20.0	0.0	81.3	\$3,686.82	2026-2040
LAKE BLVD	OASIS RD	100 FT WEST OF N MARKET ST	Buffered Bike Lane	1.98	8.7	7.3	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	2.8	1.3	6.4	8.4	4.8	20.0	0.0	79.7	\$126,958.29	2026-2040
WEST ST	EUREKA WAY	N COURT ST	Buffered Bike Lane	0.13	6.4	10.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	10.0	1.4	20.0	0.0	77.9	\$8,557.74	2026-2040
W CYPRESS AVE	PINE ST	GRAPE AVE	Buffered Bike Lane	0.18	7.2	16.7	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	6.9	5.6	11.3	0.0	77.6	\$11,766.96	2026-2040
E CYPRESS AVE (FUTURE)	SHASTA VIEW DR	VICTOR AVE	Shared-Use Path	0.70	3.1	1.3	5.0	5.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	4.3	3.9	2.8	6.3	20.0	10.0	76.6	\$623,662.77	2026-2040
HEMSTED DR	BECHELLI LN	E CYPRESS AVE/ HARTNELL AVE	Bike Route	0.47	3.6	13.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.8	8.6	7.2	1.1	20.0	0.0	76.4	\$18,343.22	2026-2040
BECHELLI LN	S BONNYVIEW RD	E CYPRESS AVE	Buffered Bike Lane	2.38	7.6	7.9	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.9	6.2	8.3	3.9	20.0	0.0	74.9	\$152,281.75	2026-2040
WEST ST; LOGAN ST	WEST ST/LINDEN AVE	LOGAN ST/RAIL-ROAD AVE	Bike Route	0.19	4.5	9.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	2.8	10.0	8.2	20.0	0.0	74.8	\$7,400.23	2026-2040
EUREKA WAY	BUENAVENTURA BLVD	COURT ST	Subject to Caltrans Process Bike Lane	1.60	9.7	8.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	7.8	9.1	4.9	13.2	0.0	74.5	\$63,355.57	2026-2040
BENTON DR	N COURT ST/RIVER-SIDE DR	N MARKET ST	Bike Lane	1.47	7.5	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	5.0	0.0	9.5	4.1	7.0	0.0	16.4	0.0	74.5	\$58,026.91	2026-2040
CHURN CREEK RD	HARTNELL AVE	S BONNYVIEW RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.83	6.6	6.4	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	8.7	7.5	5.8	20.0	0.0	74.3	\$117,437.13	2026-2040
CONSTITUTION WAY; TWIN VIEW BLVD; NORTHPOINT DR	CONSTITUTION WAY/MOUNTAIN VIEW DR	NORTHPOINT DR/ LAKE BLVD	Bike Lane	1.38	6.6	6.5	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	3.9	2.9	4.8	9.1	5.4	20.0	0.0	74.1	\$54,597.09	2026-2040
LOMA VISTA DR	CHURN CREEK RD	EL PORTAL DR	Bike Lane	0.16	8.2	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	10.0	9.8	4.1	20.0	0.0	73.9	\$6,271.80	2026-2040
DANA DR	CHURN CREEK RD	HILLTOP DR	Bike Lane	0.36	8.3	10.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.0	5.4	1.9	5.0	6.5	6.2	0.0	10.0	73.3	\$14,341.66	2026-2040
HARTNELL AVE	VICTOR AVE	SHASTA VIEW DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.74	8.8	9.8	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	5.7	7.4	10.0	13.3	0.0	72.9	\$47,202.81	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (SULPHUR CREEK RD)	DOGWOOD LN	SULPHUR CREEK RD/LOST RD	Shared-Use Path	1.46	2.9	6.2	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	3.3	9.0	8.1	4.8	0.0	18.3	0.0	72.6	\$1,299,051.37	2026-2040
COURT ST; SCHLEY AVE	SCHLEY AVE/ RAILROAD AVE	COURT ST/SOUTH ST	Buffered Bike Lane	1.80	7.7	6.9	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.1	4.8	9.0	6.8	15.0	0.0	71.3	\$115,263.65	2026-2040
WALNUT AVE	EUREKA WAY	SHASTA ST	Bike Boulevard	0.23	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	8.8	7.5	20.0	0.0	71.3	\$90,400.74	2026-2040
LOMA VISTA DR; REMI LN; ETHAN LN; MONTERRA LN	CHURN CREEK RD	ROESNER AVE	Bike Boulevard	0.35	5.0	2.8	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	9.2	8.5	6.5	20.0	0.0	71.0	\$138,911.36	2026-2040
BECHELLI LN	SAC RIVER TRAIL	BECHELLI LN (NORTHERN END)	Bike Lane	0.14	6.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	2.0	1.0	0.0	20.0	10.0	69.0	\$5,705.93	2026-2040
HILLTOP DR	SE OF LAKE BLVD/N MARKET ST	LAKE BLVD	Bike Lane	0.36	10.0	6.9	0.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	5.2	5.5	6.0	7.9	3.8	8.6	0.0	68.8	\$14,245.43	2026-2040
MISTLETOE LN	CARPENTER LN/ SHASTA PINES WAY	CHURN CREEK RD	Bike Lane	0.14	8.6	1.9	0.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	7.8	5.6	8.9	10.0	67.7	\$5,403.53	2026-2040
WRIGHT DR; ALDER ST; MOUNTAIN SHADOWS BLVD	WRIGHT DR/BIG EAGLE LN	MOUNTAIN SHADOWS BLVD/ LAKE BLVD	Bike Boulevard	0.45	3.5	9.4	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	8.0	8.0	20.0	0.0	67.7	\$180,666.24	2026-2040
OFF-STREET	100FT WEST OF BENTON DR	CENTER ST/ RIVERSIDE DR	Shared-Use Path	0.08	1.7	7.5	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	8.3	5.0	5.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	67.5	\$71,939.59	2026-2040
WEST ST	7TH ST	EUREKA WAY	Buffered Bike Lane	0.50	5.7	12.2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	7.0	1.3	20.0	0.0	66.2	\$32,193.65	2026-2040
DOGWOOD LN; BUCK-EYE TER; CLAY ST	CLAY ST/LAKE BLVD	DOGWOOD LN (EASTERN END)	Bike Boulevard	0.36	3.0	9.4	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	3.3	0.3	6.0	7.7	1.3	20.0	0.0	66.0	\$142,204.59	2026-2040
I-5 CROSSING	BECHELLI LN	HILLTOP DR/ MISTLETOE LN	Subject to Caltrans Process Shared-Use Path	0.19	6.4	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.7	5.0	7.3	0.9	18.2	0.0	65.5	\$169,313.98	2026-2040

Redding																				
Bicycle																				
Street Name	From Street	To Street	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Safety		Connectivity				Demand					Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band
					Level of Traffic Stress	Bike Crash Density	Connects to Proposed Facilities	Closes Network Gap	Connects to Existing Facility	Connects to Sac River Trail	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Population	Disadvantaged Community	Community			
BOULDER DR	CAMPERS CT	BLACK MARBLE WAY	Subject to Caltrans Process Shared-Use Path	0.18	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	3.0	6.7	10.0	20.0	0.0	64.7	\$156,338.31	2026-2040
CHURN CREEK RD	E CYPRESS AVE	DANA DR	Buffered Bike Lane	1.11	6.6	9.9	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	1.4	2.4	7.3	8.6	6.8	6.4	0.0	64.3	\$71,098.32	2026-2040
BROWNING ST	OLD ALTURAS RD	HILTOP DR	Buffered Bike Lane	1.02	7.9	6.3	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	1.0	6.9	6.9	7.9	6.6	0.0	0.0	63.4	\$65,011.84	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (ACID CANAL TRAIL)	PARKVIEW AVE	N BONNYVIEW RD/ EASTSIDE RD	Shared-Use Path	2.24	1.7	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	7.3	4.4	3.0	7.9	10.0	63.3	\$1,986,569.01	2026-2040
LOCUST ST; CIVIC CENTER DR	LOCUST ST/EAST ST	CIVIC CENTER DR/W CYPRESS AVE	Bike Route	0.46	5.4	13.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	8.2	2.1	4.3	0.0	63.0	\$18,177.29	2026-2040
MARAGLIA ST	CHURN CREEK RD	HILLTOP DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.31	4.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	7.0	7.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	63.0	\$19,663.42	2026-2040
CEDARS RD	S BONNYVIEW RD/ STATE HWY 273	EL RENO LN	Bike Lane	1.53	9.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	7.4	0.0	15.2	0.0	62.9	\$60,576.66	2026-2040
MISTLETOE LN	VICTOR AVE	SHADY LN	Bike Lane	0.29	8.5	0.9	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.7	4.4	5.9	8.1	10.0	62.6	\$11,469.44	2026-2040
LAKE BLVD	NORTHERN CITY LIMIT	OASIS RD	Bike Lane	0.56	9.3	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	6.4	4.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	62.1	\$21,957.01	2026-2040
HILLTOP DR	PALISADES AVE	SE OF LAKE BLVD/N MARKET ST	Buffered Bike Lane	1.16	10.0	2.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	8.9	3.1	8.1	3.3	6.7	0.0	62.1	\$74,136.58	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR	GOODWATER AVE	OLD ARTURAS RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.16	9.1	0.9	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.9	3.9	10.0	9.6	0.0	61.6	\$74,407.06	2026-2040
S MARKET ST	BUENAVENTURA BLVD	ANGELO AVE/ CALIFORNIA ST	Subject to Caltrans Process Bike Lane	1.69	10.0	4.5	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	4.2	6.9	2.8	5.5	10.0	60.6	\$66,779.72	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (DIESTELHORST TO DOWNTOWN TRAIL--OVER BENTON DR)	SOUTH OF DIESTELHORST BRIDGE	BENTON DR/ RIVERSIDE DR	Shared-Use Path	0.30	2.5	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	8.3	5.8	3.3	0.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	\$269,704.60	2026-2040
HARTNELL AVE	AIRPORT RD/OLD OREGON TRL	SHASTA VIEW DR	Bike Lane	1.43	9.2	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	5.4	3.9	7.6	10.3	0.0	58.1	\$56,629.67	2026-2040
8TH ST	WEST ST	8TH ST/8TH ST	Bike Lane	0.47	2.9	5.8	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	5.7	1.4	17.1	0.0	58.0	\$18,498.14	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (DIESTELHORST TO DOWNTOWN TRAIL--UNDER BENTON DR)	WEST OF DIESTELHORST BRIDGE	RIVERSIDE DR	Shared-Use Path	0.38	2.5	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	14.3	0.0	56.8	\$340,317.91	2026-2040
8TH ST; MARY ST; OVERHILL DR	8TH ST/8TH ST	OVERHILL DR/ EUREKA WAY	Bike Boulevard	0.75	1.7	5.8	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	5.0	10.0	3.8	0.8	18.3	0.0	55.4	\$301,754.22	2026-2040
BROWNING ST	OLD ALTURAS RD	HILTOP DR	Shared-Use Path	1.00	7.6	6.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	2.9	6.6	7.2	8.0	6.1	0.0	0.0	54.7	\$888,432.22	2026-2040
KESWICK DAM RD	LAKE BLVD	WESTERN CITY LIMIT	Bike Lane	0.83	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	1.8	3.4	3.5	0.5	20.0	0.0	54.2	\$32,641.71	2026-2040
BRANSTETTER LN; TEXAS SPRINGS RD	STATE HWY 273	WESTERN CITY LIMIT	Bike Lane	3.74	10.0	1.8	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	2.5	0.0	15.0	0.0	53.8	\$147,669.50	2026-2040
E BONNYVIEW RD; RADIO LN	E BONNYVIEW RD/S BONNYVIEW RD	RADIO LN/EAST-SIDE RD	Bike Lane	1.58	10.0	1.2	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	7.5	0.0	11.3	0.0	53.7	\$62,494.35	2026-2040
HAWLEY RD	NORTHERN END	COLLYER DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.41	10.0	1.7	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	5.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	53.3	\$26,419.19	2026-2040
OFF-STREET	OASIS RD	EASTERN CITY LIMIT	Buffered Bike Lane	1.49	9.2	0.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	7.5	6.5	9.7	0.0	0.0	53.2	\$95,199.95	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (LOMA VISTA TRAIL)	SAFFRON WAY	ETHAN LN/LOMA VISTA DR	Shared-Use Path	1.74	3.8	1.6	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	7.0	3.9	7.3	6.5	0.0	52.6	\$1,545,700.08	2026-2040
AIRPORT RD	STATE HWY 44	RANCHO RD	Bike Lane	1.84	10.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	2.6	3.2	0.6	3.5	10.0	52.0	\$72,811.11	2026-2040
ALTA MESA DR	RANCHO RD	HARTNELL AVE	Bike Boulevard	2.00	7.7	0.8	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	6.4	5.3	9.5	1.4	0.0	51.7	\$800,188.26	2026-2040
CHURN CREEK RD	BROWNING ST	BODENHAMER BLVD	Buffered Bike Lane	0.52	9.1	2.7	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.6	7.1	8.4	5.5	0.0	0.0	51.5	\$33,223.56	2026-2040
HILLTOP DR	BROWNING ST	PALISADES AVE	Buffered Bike Lane	0.31	9.4	6.3	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	6.7	8.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.3	\$19,570.33	2026-2040
HILLTOP DR	PALISADES AVE	SE OF LAKE BLVD/ MARKET ST	Shared-Use Path	1.17	10.0	2.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	0.0	8.3	2.9	7.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	51.3	\$1,039,912.76	2026-2040
WESTSIDE RD	CANYON RD	BUENAVENTURA BLVD	Shared-Use Path	3.55	9.2	3.6	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	4.6	7.3	0.0	6.0	0.0	51.2	\$3,152,907.53	2026-2040
QUARTZ HILL RD	TERRA NOVA DR	BENTON DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.93	9.5	0.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	6.5	1.4	3.5	0.0	10.0	0.0	50.9	\$59,488.39	2026-2040
S BONNYVIEW RD	BECHELLI LN	CHURN CREEK RD	Subject to Caltrans Process Buffered Bike Lane	0.31	10.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	50.8	\$19,800.76	2026-2040
TWIN VIEW BLVD; MOUNTAIN VIEW DR; COLLYER DR	TWIN VIEW BLVD/ OASIS RD	COLLYER DR/ HAWLEY RD	Bike Boulevard	2.47	4.5	1.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	1.9	3.9	0.0	20.0	0.0	50.5	\$987,044.62	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (ACID CANAL TRAIL)	PARK MARINA DR	PARKVIEW AVE	Shared-Use Path	0.18	5.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	7.5	2.5	5.0	0.0	50.0	\$163,281.70	2026-2040
BUENAVENTURA BLVD	PLACER ST	EUREKA WAY	Buffered Bike Lane	0.83	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	2.0	9.3	4.3	2.9	0.0	49.9	\$52,853.48	2026-2040
PLACER ST	CONTINENTAL ST	PLACER ST (EAST-ERN END)	Bike Boulevard	0.31	0.0	13.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.8	10.0	9.1	1.8	3.6	0.0	49.7	\$124,498.34	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (CHURN CREEK)	CYPRESS AVE	CHURN CREEK RD/ HARTMEYER LN	Shared-Use Path	3.48	2.4	2.8	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	3.3	2.5	5.6	14.8	0.0	49.7	\$3,090,274.09	2026-2040
EASTSIDE RD	N BONNYVIEW RD	S BONNYVIEW RD	Shared-Use Path	1.02	6.5	3.1	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	4.5	0.0	20.0	0.0	49.6	\$901,135.75	2026-2040
OLD ARTURAS	VICTOR AVE	EASTERN CITY LIMIT	Shared-Use Path	1.33	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.2	10.0	0.0	0.0	49.3	\$1,178,829.25	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW	GOODWATER AVE	OLD ARTURAS RD	Shared-Use Path	1.16	6.1	1.6	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	0.8	5.2	10.0	3.9	0.0	48.8	\$1,029,551.82	2026-2040
BUENAVENTURA BLVD	PLACER ST	EUREKA WAY	Shared-Use Path	0.82	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	2.0	8.3	6.7	0.0	0.0	48.7	\$731,506.22	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (SULPHUR CREEK)	KESWICK DAM RD	MARKET ST	Shared-Use Path	2.84	2.3	2.5	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	47.7	\$2,521,013.61	2026-2040
LAKESIDE DR; Foothill Blvd; Las Animas Dr; Monte Bello Dr; Manzanita Hills Ave	MANZANITA HILLS AVE/SHASTA ST	LAKESIDE DR/ BUENAVENTURA BLVD	Bike Boulevard	0.94	0.8	2.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	6.0	4.6	8.5	3.1	0.0	46.8	\$376,944.94	2026-2040
S BONNYVIEW RD	STATE HWY 273	BECHELLI LN	Buffered Bike Lane	1.70	9.4	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.8	4.5	0.0	7.2	0.0	46.8	\$108,584.62	2026-2040
STATE HIGHWAY 44 CROSSING	PARK MARINA DR	WB STATE HIGHWAY 44 OFF- AND ON-RAMPS	Subject to Caltrans Process Shared-Use Path	0.08	10.0	3.5	5.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	7.5	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	46.0	\$72,044.33	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (PLACER ST)	PLACER ST (EAST-ERN END)	PARK MARINA DR	Shared-Use Path	0.08	3.3	3.5	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	9.2	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	46.0	\$74,096.20	2026-2040

Redding																				
Bicycle																				
Street Name	From Street	To Street	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Safety		Connectivity				Demand					Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band
					Level of Traffic Stress	Bike Crash Density	Connects to Proposed Facilities	Closes Network Gap	Connects to Existing Facility	Connects to Sac River Trail	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Population	Disad-vantaged Community	Com-unity			
S BONNYVIEW RD	BEHELLIN	CHURCH CREEK RD	Subject to Caltrans Process Shared-Use Path	0.31	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	45.5	\$274,126.82	2026-2040
VENUS WAY; MERCURY DR; VEGA ST	VENUS WAY/SHASTA VIEW DR	VEGA ST/VICTOR AVE	Bike Boulevard	0.84	3.4	1.3	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	7.7	4.1	9.5	0.0	0.0	44.2	\$334,446.28	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (VIEW TRAIL)	MISSION DEL ORO DR	BROWNING ST/VIEW AVE	Shared-Use Path	0.42	8.6	2.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	6.4	6.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	43.6	\$373,848.05	2026-2040
OASIS RD	LAKE BLVD	AKRICH ST/OLD OREGON TRL	Buffered Bike Lane	4.15	8.2	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	4.4	5.9	0.0	5.2	0.0	43.2	\$265,887.61	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (SULPHUR CREEK)	N MARKET ST	ARBORETUM PERIMETER TRAIL	Shared-Use Path	0.33	4.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	1.0	0.0	8.0	0.0	43.0	\$295,577.80	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (LINDEN CREEK)	BUENA VENTURA BLVD	WEST ST	Shared-Use Path	0.91	0.5	1.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.4	2.3	5.8	4.2	20.0	0.0	42.7	\$810,952.41	2026-2040
BUENAVENTURA BLVD	STATE HWY 273	PLACER ST	Buffered Bike Lane	2.24	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	1.5	3.7	0.4	3.7	0.0	42.4	\$143,429.99	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (LITTLE CHURN CREEK)	CHURN CREEK	LAWRENCE RD	Shared-Use Path	0.77	0.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.3	5.8	0.9	7.1	18.8	0.0	42.4	\$680,406.02	2026-2040
PALISADES AVE	(SOUTHERN END)	HILLTOP DR	Shared-Use Path	0.42	8.9	3.1	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.7	6.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.0	\$375,361.38	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR	RANCHO RD	GALAXY WAY	Buffered Bike Lane	1.18	10.0	2.1	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	3.4	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	41.5	\$75,656.63	2026-2040
VICTOR AVE	CHURN CREEK RD	EL VISTA ST/PVT ROAD	Buffered Bike Lane	0.70	9.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	15.0	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.9	2.1	4.2	0.0	0.0	41.5	\$45,109.71	2026-2040
AIRPORT RD (FUTURE FRONTAGE RD)	RANCHO RD	SHASTA VIEW DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.81	9.5	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	5.2	0.0	8.6	0.0	40.7	\$51,820.93	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (CLOVER CREEK)	CLOVER CREEK PRESERVE	HARTNELL AVE	Shared-Use Path	0.54	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	6.7	1.7	8.9	2.2	0.0	40.0	\$482,280.79	2026-2040
OLD ARTURAS	BROWNING ST	VICTOR AVE	Shared-Use Path	0.15	8.6	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	6.4	10.0	0.0	0.0	40.0	\$131,169.00	2026-2040
MADISON RIVER DR; YELLOWSTONE DR; WESTERN OAK DR; SARATOGA DR; EL VISTA ST	BANJO LN/GOOD-WATER AVE	EL VISTA ST/VICTOR AVE	Bike Boulevard	1.60	4.6	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	3.6	3.2	5.2	0.0	0.0	39.2	\$638,045.47	2026-2040
AIRPORT RD	HOLE IN ONE DR	SHASTA VIEW DR	Bike Lane	2.32	9.4	1.9	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	0.0	8.9	0.0	39.2	\$91,625.85	2026-2040
CHURN CREEK RD	CHURN CREEK RD/S BONNYVIEW RD	RANCHO RD	Buffered Bike Lane	0.80	8.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	1.5	6.7	0.0	38.8	\$51,427.91	2026-2040
COLLEGE VIEW DR	OLD OREGON TRL	CHURN CREEK RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.70	9.4	2.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.5	6.9	0.6	0.0	0.0	38.3	\$108,671.01	2026-2040
CHURN CREEK ROAD	CHURN CREEK/ BONNYVIEW RD	RANCHO RD	Shared-Use Path	0.79	8.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	1.1	10.4	0.0	37.8	\$698,508.43	2026-2040
OFF-STREET	HILLTOP DR	PEPPERTREE PARK	Shared-Use Path	0.59	1.3	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	3.9	5.0	1.3	2.5	0.0	37.6	\$524,228.72	2026-2040
BELTLINE RD	OASIS RD	CATERPILLAR RD	Bike Lane	0.56	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	2.5	3.5	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.8	\$22,155.96	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR	HEMMINGWAY ST	COLLEGE VIEW DR	Buffered Bike Lane	1.04	10.0	2.2	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	36.3	\$66,736.70	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (BOULDER CREEK/CHURN CREEK)	CHURN CREEK RD	OLD ALTURAS RD	Shared-Use Path	1.62	1.9	1.7	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.5	7.9	1.4	7.6	0.0	0.0	36.0	\$1,441,149.03	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR	RANCHO RD	GALAXY WAY	Shared-Use Path	1.18	5.3	1.4	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	5.9	3.2	0.0	4.7	0.0	0.0	35.5	\$1,048,589.24	2026-2040
RANCHO RD	CHURN CREEK RD	AIRPORT RD	Shared-Use Path	1.74	9.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.8	5.1	1.5	3.0	0.0	0.0	34.4	\$1,544,801.90	2026-2040
VENTURE PKWY/ RANCHO RD	RANCHO RD/ AIRPORT RD	AIRPORT RD/FIG TREE LN	Bike Lane	4.30	7.9	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	2.5	0.0	6.7	0.0	34.1	\$169,740.12	2026-2040
TIDMORE LN	COLLYER DR	COLLEGE VIEW DR	Shared-Use Path	0.24	7.1	1.9	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	6.4	1.4	0.0	0.0	33.9	\$209,891.45	2026-2040
RANCHO RD	CHURN CREEK RD	AIRPORT RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.73	9.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	5.3	1.5	1.4	1.1	0.0	33.9	\$110,746.75	2026-2040
E BONNYVIEW RD (FUTURE)	CREEKSIDE ST/ SACRAMENTO DR	S BONNYVIEW RD	Buffered Bike Lane	0.68	4.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	4.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	33.7	\$43,227.70	2026-2040
E BONNYVIEW RD	S BONNYVIEW RD	SACRAMENTO RD	Shared-Use Path	0.66	4.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.2	4.5	0.0	2.0	0.0	33.7	\$583,335.09	2026-2040
GIRVAN RD	CREEKSIDE ST/ ISLAND DR	STATE HWY/ EASTSIDE RD	Bike Lane	0.77	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	2.7	3.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	32.7	\$30,395.78	2026-2040
BUENAVENTURA BLVD	STARLIGHT BLVD	PLACER ST	Shared-Use Path	0.73	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	3.3	2.0	5.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	32.0	\$646,000.50	2026-2040
VICTOR AVE	CHURN CREEK RD	EL VISTA ST/PVT ROAD	Shared-Use Path	0.70	5.8	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	7.5	1.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.8	\$623,351.88	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR	HEMMINGWAY ST	COLLEGE VIEW DR	Shared-Use Path	1.06	5.4	2.2	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.1	6.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	31.8	\$941,169.46	2026-2040
QUARTZ HILL RD	WESTERN CITY LIMIT	TERRA NOVA DR	Buffered Bike Lane	0.89	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.0	12.0	0.0	30.9	\$57,008.56	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (BOULDER CREEK)	CHURN CREEK RD	NB I-5 OFF-RAMP/ STATE HWY 299 (SE QUAD)	Shared-Use Path	1.41	2.0	1.7	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	7.8	1.3	0.7	0.0	0.0	30.9	\$1,254,273.71	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (CHURN CREEK)	OLD ALTURAS RD	E CYPRESS AVE	Shared-Use Path	1.70	2.8	1.1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	3.6	1.6	9.2	5.6	0.0	29.9	\$1,507,493.00	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR (FUTURE)	SHASTA VIEW DR/ BOLAM CREEK RD	RANCHO RD	Buffered Bike Lane	1.40	6.3	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	4.7	0.0	2.7	0.0	29.8	\$89,811.13	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR (FUTURE)	SHASTA VIEW DR/ BOLAM CREEK RD	RANCHO RD	Shared-Use Path	1.45	5.6	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	5.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	28.9	\$1,290,562.03	2026-2040
CANYON RD	STATE HWY 273	SOUTHWESTERN CITY LIMIT	Bike Lane	2.79	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	4.9	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.3	\$109,989.84	2026-2040
STAR DR; SACRAMENTO DR; CREEKSIDE ST	CREEKSIDE ST/ ISLAND DR	STAR DR/EAST-SIDE RD	Bike Boulevard	1.74	2.2	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	4.2	3.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	28.2	\$696,262.95	2026-2040
PALACIO DR	CHURN CREEK RD	PALACIO DR (SOUTH OF FRANCISCAN TRAIL)	Shared-Use Path	0.58	2.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	5.7	4.3	0.0	0.0	27.4	\$511,690.78	2026-2040
EUREKA WAY	LOWER SPRINGS RD	BUENAVENTURA BLVD	Bike Lane	1.07	10.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.0	0.3	4.0	4.0	0.0	0.0	27.3	\$42,281.42	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (CHURN CREEK)	CROOKED OAK LN	HAWLEY LN	Shared-Use Path	2.55	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.0	20.0	0.0	26.7	\$2,262,572.74	2026-2040
CASCADE BLVD	NORTHERN CITY LIMIT	OASIS RD	Bike Lane	0.66	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	\$26,239.83	2026-2040
OLD OREGON TRL	NORTHEAST CITY LIMIT	OASIS RD/OLD OREGON	Buffered Bike Lane	2.31	8.4	0.8	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.3	\$147,858.22	2026-2040
CANYON DR	STATE HWY 273	SOUTHWESTERN CITY LIMIT	Bike Lane	0.75	9.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	5.4	0.0	8.8	0.0	23.9	\$29,739.16	2026-2040
MISSION DE ORO DR; MILL VALLEY PKWY	MILL VALLEY PKWY (NORTHERN END)	MISSION DE ORO DR/TANGLEWOOD DR	Bike Boulevard	0.71	2.3	2.7	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.3	5.4	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.5	\$282,626.52	2026-2040
OFF-STREET (WRIGHT DR)	BELTLINE RD (SOUTHERN END)	WRIGHT DR/BIG EAGLE LN	Shared-Use Path	0.10	5.0	3.8	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	2.5	5.0	0.0	23.3	\$86,913.79	2026-2040
SHASTA VIEW DR	COLLYER DR	HOLLOW LN	Shared-Use Path	0.39	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	\$349,988.12	2026-2040

Redding																					
Bicycle																					
Street Name	From Street	To Street	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Safety		Connectivity				Demand					Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band	
					Level of Traffic Stress	Bike Crash Density	Connects to Proposed Facilities	Closes Network Gap	Connects to Existing Facility	Connects to Sac River Trail	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Population	Disadvantaged Community	Community				
SHASTA VIEW DR	COLLYER DR	HOLLOW LN	Buffered Bike Lane	0.39	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.9	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	\$25,237.74	2026-2040
OFF-STREET	CANYON CREEK RD	WEST OF CANYON CREEK RD	Shared-Use Path	0.30	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	\$267,326.43	2026-2040
AKRICH ST	OASIS RD/OLD OREGON TRL	NORTHERN CITY LIMIT	Bike Lane	1.06	4.5	0.0	5.0	0.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	19.5	\$41,712.53	2026-2040
BUENAVENTURA BLVD	STATE HWY 273	TETON DR	Shared-Use Path	0.63	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.4	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.8	\$563,628.85	2026-2040
BELTLINE RD	CATERPILLAR RD	BELTLINE RD (SOUTHERN END)	Bike Boulevard	0.36	4.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.6	\$144,180.09	2026-2040
CHURN CREEK TRAIL - CONNECTION	OASIS RD	PINE GROVE AVE	Shared-Use Path	0.66	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	\$587,064.21	2026-2040
OFF-STREET	RIVERSIDE DR	BONNYVIEW BOAT RAMP	Shared-Use Path	0.56	0.0	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.3	\$492,957.08	2026-2040
Redding Bicycle Subtotal																			\$60,289,475		
Redding																					
Pedestrian																					
Street Name	From Street	To Street	Project Description	Length (Miles)	Safety		Demand					Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band					
					Pedestrian Crash Density	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Population Density	Disadvantaged Community										
Oregon St	Shasta St	Yuba St	Sidewalk	0.43	20.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	7.1	5.0	10.0	20.0	82.1	\$244,853.46	2026-2045						
California St	Gold St	SR 273	Sidewalk	1.14	20.0	0.0	9.5	7.5	5.0	10.0	20.0	72.0	\$644,656.97	2026-2045							
East St	W Cypress Ave	South St	Sidewalk	0.70	20.0	0.0	8.8	10.0	5.0	5.6	11.3	60.6	\$394,552.71	2026-2045							
E. Cypress Ave	Alfreda Way	Victor Ave	Sidewalk	0.93	5.0	0.0	9.1	7.3	3.6	5.5	20.0	50.5	\$529,883.57	2026-2045							
Redwood Blvd	Northpoint Dr	(n/o) Hardwood Blvd	Sidewalk	0.14	3.8	0.0	5.0	3.5	5.0	10.0	20.0	47.3	\$82,059.22	2026-2045							
Hartnell Ave	Victor Ave	Shasta View Dr	Sidewalk	1.47	7.9	0.0	2.8	5.7	5.0	10.0	13.3	44.8	\$836,164.01	2026-2045							
Lake Blvd	Keswick Dam Rd	Panorama Dr	Sidewalk	1.26	5.0	0.0	2.5	7.1	5.0	5.0	20.0	44.6	\$713,679.61	2026-2045							
Continental St	Trinity St	SR 44	Sidewalk	0.43	9.4	0.0	6.1	4.7	5.0	6.1	12.2	43.6	\$242,232.20	2026-2045							
Branstetter Ln	Cedars Rd	Westside Rd	Sidewalk	2.92	7.5	0.0	0.0	8.8	5.0	0.0	20.0	41.3	\$1,655,902.01	2026-2045							
E. Cypress Ave	Victor Ave	Shasta View Dr	Shared use path	0.70	2.5	0.0	4.2	4.0	2.1	6.5	20.0	39.3	\$622,051.13	2026-2045							
Cedars Rd	Westside Rd	Branstetter Ln	Sidewalk	0.40	5.6	0.0	0.0	5.9	5.0	0.0	20.0	36.5	\$226,232.24	2026-2045							
Westside Rd	El Reno Ln	Cedars Rd	Sidewalk	1.15	5.0	0.0	0.0	7.6	4.1	0.0	18.8	35.4	\$652,204.01	2026-2045							
Locust St	Canal Dr	Athens Ave	Sidewalk	0.26	10.0	0.0	10.0	8.8	5.0	0.0	0.0	33.8	\$148,546.96	2026-2045							
Eureka Way	Buenaventura Blvd	e/o Overhill Dr	Sidewalk	1.23	3.6	0.0	8.1	5.1	5.0	4.8	6.7	33.2	\$698,204.28	2026-2045							
Kenyon Dr	Cedars Rd	Westside Rd	Sidewalk	0.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.9	5.0	0.0	20.0	32.9	\$151,358.08	2026-2045							
Browning St	Hilltop Dr	Old Arturas Rd	Shared use path	2.00	4.6	2.9	6.6	7.2	5.0	6.1	0.0	32.4	\$1,776,608.40	2026-2045							
Alta Mesa Dr	Hartnell Ave	Satum Skwy	Sidewalk	1.06	3.8	0.0	4.2	6.5	4.6	10.0	3.1	32.3	\$599,522.81	2026-2045							
Westside Rd	Buenaventura Blvd	Westside Rd/SR 273	Shared use path	1.80	8.7	0.0	0.0	6.2	4.5	0.0	12.0	31.4	\$1,596,346.93	2026-2045							
Shasta View Dr (east side)	Goodwater Ave	Old Alturas Rd	Shared use path	2.17	0.0	0.0	7.6	0.9	3.5	10.0	8.7	30.7	\$1,928,423.51	2026-2045							
Shasta View Dr	Goodwater	Old Alturas Rd	Sidewalk	1.09	0.0	0.0	7.2	0.9	2.6	10.0	9.6	30.2	\$615,932.33	2026-2045							
Browning St	Canby Rd	Churn Creek Rd	Sidewalk	0.22	3.9	2.8	10.0	5.0	5.0	3.3	0.0	30.0	\$125,968.85	2026-2045							
Athens Ave	South St	W. Cypress Ave	Sidewalk	0.77	8.3	0.0	9.3	6.3	5.0	0.0	0.0	29.0	\$433,975.44	2026-2045							
Loma Vista Dr	Victor Ave (450 ft n/o Shelby Rd)	Shasta View Dr (167 ft n/o Castlewood Dr)	Shared use path	0.76	0.0	0.0	9.1	7.5	2.8	8.8	0.0	28.1	\$672,073.93	2026-2045							
Canby Rd	Browning St	Tanglewood Dr	Sidewalk	0.65	2.9	1.4	9.3	8.6	5.0	0.0	0.0	27.1	\$370,069.01	2026-2045							
Cedars Rd	El Reno Ln	Kenyon Dr	Sidewalk	0.76	4.0	0.0	0.0	6.0	5.0	0.0	12.0	27.0	\$432,111.28	2026-2045							
El Reno Ln	Westside Rd	Cedars Rd	Sidewalk	0.29	5.0	0.0	0.0	6.3	5.0	0.0	10.0	26.3	\$166,055.41	2026-2045							
Radio Ln; E Bonnyview Rd	Radio Ln/Veterans Ln	E. Bonnyview Rd/S. Bonnyview Rd	Sidewalk	2.79	1.8	0.0	0.0	8.6	5.0	0.0	10.0	25.4	\$1,581,919.95	2026-2045							
Loma Vista Dr	Loma Vista Dr/Roesner Ave	Victor Ave	Shared use path	0.59	0.0	0.0	10.0	4.3	2.5	2.5	5.0	24.3	\$519,952.84	2026-2045							
Hawley Rd	Collyer Dr	Hawley Rd (e/o Norwich Ct)	Sidewalk	1.27	0.0	0.0	0.7	1.1	2.1	0.0	20.0	24.0	\$722,643.37	2026-2045							
Hawley Rd	Hawley Rd (e/o Norwich Ct)	Constitution Way	Shared use path	0.55	0.0	0.0	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	23.3	\$485,608.46	2026-2045							
Waverly Ave; Eastside Rd	Waverly Ave/Beretta Ln	Eastside Rd/Girvan Rd	Sidewalk	1.07	4.1	0.0	6.4	7.7	4.5	0.0	0.0	22.7	\$608,020.99	2026-2045							
Churn Creek Rd	Browning St	College View Dr	Sidewalk	3.23	0.6	0.0	5.4	6.4	4.6	5.2	0.0	22.2	\$1,829,638.01	2026-2045							
Lakeside Dr	Ridge Dr	Buenaventura Blvd	Sidewalk	0.85	0.0	0.0	7.5	0.5	3.1	10.0	0.0	21.1	\$483,518.94	2026-2045							
Buenaventura Blvd (west side)	Eureka Way	Placer St	Shared use path	0.83	0.0	0.0	6.4	2.0	5.0	4.3	2.9	20.6	\$732,905.44	2026-2045							
Old Alturas Rd (north side)	Victor Ave	Eastern City Limit	Shared use path	1.31	0.0	0.0	1.3	4.9	4.0	10.0	0.0	20.2	\$1,162,318.06	2026-2045							
Buenaventura Blvd; Starlight Blvd	Buenaventura Blvd/Placer St	Starlight Blvd (960 ft e/o Buenaventura Blvd)	Sidewalk	1.87	0.0	0.0	4.7	2.0	2.1	0.6	8.2	17.6	\$1,062,192.02	2026-2045							
Westwood Ave; Paso Dr	Westwood Ave/Westside Rd	Paso Dr/Sycamore Dr	Sidewalk	0.72	3.8	0.0	0.0	8.8	4.4	0.0	0.0	16.9	\$406,597.09	2026-2045							
Hilltop Rd	Palisades Ave	Lake Blvd/N Market St	Shared use path	2.34	0.4	0.0	8.3	2.9	5.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	\$2,079,627.73	2026-2045							
E. Bonnyview Rd	S. Bonnyview Rd	Sacramento Rd	Shared use path	0.66	2.5	0.0	0.0	8.2	3.0	0.0	2.0	15.7	\$583,285.84	2026-2045							
Collyer Dr	Hawley Rd	Twin Tower Dr	Sidewalk	1.70	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	5.0	0.0	8.0	15.2	\$964,420.39	2026-2045							
Shasta View Dr	Rancho Rd	Galaxy Way	Shared use path	1.18	0.0	0.0	6.3	3.4	0.0	4.7	0.0	14.4	\$1,049,314.69	2026-2045							
S. Bonnyview Rd; Churn Creek Rd	S. Bonnyveiv Rd/Bechelli Ln	Churn Creek Rd/Victor Ave	Shared use path	1.05	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.1	0.0	0.4	9.6	13.3	\$934,524.11	2026-2045							
Shasta View Dr (east side)	Hemingway St	College View Dr	Shared use path	1.04	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	4.2	0.0	0.0	12.5	\$925,270.13	2026-2045							
Palacio Dr	Churn Creek Rd	Palacio Dr (s/o Franciscan Trail)	Shared use path	1.15	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.6	3.6	4.3	0.0	12.4	\$1,023,201.61	2026-2045							
Quartz Hill Rd	(1,485 ft e/o) River Ridge Dr	Tierra Nova Dr	Sidewalk	0.94	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	12.0	\$533,207.38	2026-2045							
Victor Ave	Churn Creek Rd	El Vista St	Shared use path	0.70	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.9	1.3	4.2	0.0	11.8	\$625,532.14	2026-2045							
Churn Creek Rd	S. Bonnyview Rd/Churn Creek Rd	Victor Ave	Sidewalk	1.61	0.0	0.0	2.4	0.0	0.0	1.2	7.3	10.9	\$911,059.41	2026-2045							
Redwood Blvd	Butternut Trail	Caterpillar Rd	Sidewalk	0.84	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	8.8	\$475,569.35	2026-2045							
Buenaventura Blvd (east side)	Placer St	Starlight Blvd	Shared use path	1.82	0.0	0.0	3.0	2.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	8.0	\$1,617,962.31	2026-2045							
Shasta View Dr (east side)	Collyer Dr	Hollow Ln	Shared use path	0.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.5	3.3	0.0	0.0	6.8	\$359,429.43	2026-2045							
Shasta View Dr	Shasta View Dr/Bolam Creek Rd	Rancho Rd	Shared use path	1.40	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.1	3.0	0.0	2.7	6.8	\$1,244,912.29	2026-2045							
Redding Pedestrian Subtotal																			\$39,482,300		

Redding

Spot Treatments

Location	Project Description	Safety	Demand					Equity		Total	Cost	Time Band
		Pedestrian Crash Density	Transit Center	Parks	School	Bus Stop	Population Density	Disadvantaged Community	Community			
HARTNELL AVE AND CHURN CREEK RD	Intersection Improvement	20.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	20.0	0.0	80.0	\$94,927	2026-2040
CYPRESS AVE AND PINE ST	Intersection Improvement - Subject to Caltrans Process	20.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	6.7	13.3	0.0	70.0	\$312,576	2026-2040
HARTNELL AVE AT YANA AVE	Intersection Improvement	20.0	0.0	2.8	10.0	6.7	10.0	20.0	0.0	69.4	\$94,927	2026-2040
EUREKA WAY AND WALNUT AVE	Intersection Improvement - Subject to Caltrans Process	15.0	0.0	7.5	10.0	10.0	3.0	20.0	0.0	65.5	\$312,576	2026-2040
I-5 AND CYPRESS AVE	Intersection Improvement - Subject to Caltrans Process	20.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	5.0	6.7	20.0	0.0	61.7	\$312,576	2026-2040
CYPRESS AVE AND CHURN CREEK RD	Intersection Improvement	7.5	0.0	5.0	8.8	10.0	6.3	20.0	0.0	57.5	\$94,927	2026-2040
LAKE BLVD SOUTH OF CANADA DR	Intersection Improvement	5.0	3.3	5.0	5.8	10.0	3.3	6.7	0.0	39.2	\$94,927	2026-2040
STATE HWY 273 AT BRESLAUER WAY	Intersection Improvement - Subject to Caltrans Process	5.0	0.0	0.0	10.0	10.0	0.0	13.3	0.0	38.3	\$312,576	2026-2040
BROWNING ST AND LANCERS LN	Intersection Improvement	5.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	30.0	\$94,927	2026-2040
DANA DR AND HILLTOP DR	Intersection Improvement - Subject to Caltrans Process	5.0	0.0	5.0	6.3	5.0	3.8	0.0	0.0	25.0	\$312,576	2026-2040
SUNDIAL BRIDGE DR AND STATE HWY 44	Intersection Improvement - Subject to Caltrans Process	0.0	0.0	10.0	6.7	6.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	23.3	\$312,576	2026-2040
I-5 AND HILLTOP DR	Intersection Improvement - Subject to Caltrans Process	3.0	0.0	5.0	5.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	\$312,576	2026-2040
HILLTOP DR AND SANDPOINTE DR	Intersection Improvement	0.0	0.0	10.0	2.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	22.0	\$94,927	2026-2040
Redding Spot Treatment Subtotal											\$2,757,595	

City of Redding Long-Term Project Total **\$102,529,370**
City of Redding ATP Total **\$121,276,401**