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1. Executive Summary

The Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan guides the future development of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, paseos, and trails within the City. This Plan is an update to the original Plan adopted in 2008. This Plan focuses on the city’s bicycle and pedestrian network, planning and policies related to bicycling and walking, non-motorized connections to transit, safe routes to schools, and complete streets.

The overarching, long-term goal of this Plan is to provide the cultural, infrastructure and institutional support that will guide the development of a pleasant, safe, and convenient non-motorized transportation network that everyone in Santa Clarita can use for their travel needs. The Plan guides Santa Clarita toward the goals of providing bikeways, trails and paseos for all Santa Clarita residents, increasing the number of people who bike and walk for everyday needs, improving safety for bicyclists and pedestrians, and increasing public awareness and positive attitudes about biking and walking in Santa Clarita.

1.1. Purpose of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan was developed to:

**Identify and prioritize bikeway needs.** The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan identifies existing bicycle network needs and recommends projects that will further enhance and improve bicycling conditions in Santa Clarita for all types of riders.

**Provide needed facilities and services.** Through the use of surveys conducted as part of the 2008 plan, meetings with local stakeholders, field work, local data on biking and walking, and best engineering practices, this Plan identifies the facilities and services that are needed to improve non-motorized transportation in Santa Clarita.

**Enhance and preserve the quality of life in Santa Clarita.** The development and maintenance of bicycle and pedestrian facilities provides for people-friendly streets, paths, trails, and activity centers available to everyone, and supports sustainable community development. Bicycling and walking can reduce traffic congestion, vehicle exhaust emissions, noise, and energy consumption by encouraging healthier and more active forms of travel.

**Improve safety.** This Plan seeks to increase safety for bicyclists and pedestrians in Santa Clarita through recommendations in design practices and guidelines, proposed projects and suggested measures of public education and enforcement.

**Maximize funding sources for implementation.** A key source of funding for bicycle construction projects is the California Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA). The State of California requires that applicants to the BTA have an adopted bikeways plan that includes a number of specific elements related to bicycle commuting, land uses, multi-modal connections, funding, and public input, and be updated every five years. The Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan includes the elements required by the State to qualify for consideration for available funding.
Prioritize capital improvements. This Plan provides the City of Santa Clarita with a prioritized list of bicycle and pedestrian capital improvements. This list reflects the input of Santa Clarita residents over the course of the Plan’s development, gathered at public meetings, through online public outreach efforts, and during the public comment period. Improvements also reflect discussions with City Staff and empirical data such as reported bicycle and pedestrian collisions and bicycle and pedestrian counts.

1.2. Biking and Walking in Santa Clarita Today

Since adoption of the 2008 Plan, Santa Clarita has made much progress toward integrating biking and walking into everyday life, which is shown in Table 1-1 below. The City has over 35 miles of off-street paths that are used by residents in all neighborhoods. A number of Santa Clarita’s residential areas are connected by a network of paseos. Nearly 30 miles of on-street bicycle lanes and bike routes have been signed and striped on City streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Paths</td>
<td>The City constructed 4.0 miles of bike paths, including portions of the Newhall Ranch Bike Path and Santa Clara River Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>The City striped 11.4 miles of bike lanes, including facilities on 16th Street, Tournament Road, Decoro Drive, Tourney Road, Centre Pointe Parkway, Rockwell Canyon, and through the Valencia Industrial Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Routes</td>
<td>The City added 2.9 miles of bike routes on Orchard Village Road and Golden Triangle Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>The City expanded its multi-purpose trail network, including a trail south of the Santa Clara River between the Iron Horse and Promenade trailheads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailheads</td>
<td>The City completed the Iron Horse Trailhead, providing new access to the Santa Clara River Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Countdown Signals</td>
<td>The City upgraded all of its signals to have pedestrian countdown signals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (Infra)</td>
<td>The City installed pedestrian improvements at 21 schools between 2008 and 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School (Non-Infra)</td>
<td>The City implemented a Safe Routes to School Program including all 26 elementary schools between 2008 and 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs</td>
<td>The City continued its Bike to Work Day Challenge and hosted additional events for the Amgen Bike Tour of California. Trail maps were installed at seven existing trailheads through a grant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2.1. Bicycle Facilities

Santa Clarita’s existing bicycle network is shown in Figure 1-1. The network consists primarily of Class I off-street paths and Class II on-street bike lanes. Class III bike routes are designated on Bouquet Canyon Road, Wiley Canyon
Road, Orchard Village Road, Golden Triangle Road, and Newhall Avenue. Bike paths run parallel to the Santa Clara River and its tributaries, and parallel to major roads, including Soledad Canyon Road and McBean Parkway.

The first bike paths built in the City generally followed the Santa Clara River and its tributaries. Newer paths have been developed which connect residential neighborhoods to the river paths. The network provides connections to the Santa Clarita Metrolink Station, several schools, businesses along Soledad Canyon Road and McBean Parkway, the Valencia Industrial Center, and to recreational opportunities along the Rivers.

Major paths include the South Fork Trail, along a south tributary of the Santa Clara River; the Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail, along Soledad Canyon Road; the Santa Clara River Trail; the San Francisquito Creek Trail, the bike path along Newhall Ranch Road, and the path along Golden Valley Road. Some paths, such as South Fork, are recreational in nature, and are part of a combined pedestrian-equestrian-bicycle trail corridor. Other paths, such as the Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail, are more commuter-oriented and run parallel to major roadways.

The City’s existing bike paths are listed in Table 1-2. Connections to the City bike path network are provided at most major roadway intersections. In addition to these connection points, the City maintains six trailheads, and has plans to develop three more trailheads as additional trails are developed. Trailheads are listed below in Table 1-3.

Table 1-2:
Existing Class I Bike Paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Center Dr</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail (N of Cinema Dr)</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail (S of Cinema Dr)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail</td>
<td>Auto Center Dr Trailhead</td>
<td>Camp Plenty Road</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Dr Path</td>
<td>Rye Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Decorro Dr</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faircliff Rd Path</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Seco Canyon Rd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Rd Path</td>
<td>330’ east of CA-14</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Mountain Drive</td>
<td>Soledad Bridge</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Pkwy Path</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>0.5 miles S of Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path Connector</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge Dr</td>
<td>Arbor Hill Wy</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisquito Creek Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 1-3: Existing Trailheads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Provides Access To</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Horse Trailhead</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway and Tourney Road</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Automobile and horse trailer parking, equestrian staging area, shade structure, information kiosk and drinking fountain on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade Trailhead</td>
<td>Creekside Rd and McBean Parkway</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Automobile parking, near shopping center and eating establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trailhead</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Blvd between Valencia Blvd and Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Automobile and horse trailer parking, picnic tables, drinking fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon Trailhead</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Rd at Lost Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>Automobile parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Plenty Road Trailhead</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Rd at Camp Plenty Rd</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Trail, Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>Automobile parking, drinking fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Center Trailhead</td>
<td>Valencia Blvd at Auto Center Dr</td>
<td>South Fork Trail, Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>Off-street parking, drinking fountains, shade structure, informational kiosk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Santa Clarita Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department, June 2012.
Figure 1-1: Existing Bicycle Facilities and Trails
Existing on-street bicycle facilities are presented below in Table 1-4.

### Table 1-4:
**Existing On-Street Bicycle Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th St</td>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>Newhall Ave</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Scott</td>
<td>Rye Canyon Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Stanford – Vanderbilt Wy</td>
<td>Ave Scott</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Alamogordo Rd</td>
<td>Steve Jon St</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd (EB Only)</td>
<td>Espuela Dr</td>
<td>Alamogordo Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgrove Blvd</td>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Creekside Dr</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Pointe Pkwy</td>
<td>Golden Triangle Rd</td>
<td>Ruether Ave</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Rd</td>
<td>Hercules St</td>
<td>Kelly Johnson Pkwy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Seco Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Haskell Canyon Rd</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoro Dr</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Vista Delgade Dr</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockweiler Dr</td>
<td>Ivy Ln</td>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules St – Kelly Johnson Pkwy</td>
<td>Constellation Rd</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Drive</td>
<td>Via Princesa</td>
<td>Canyon Park Blvd</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell Canyon Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>Valencia Blvd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seco Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Tupele Ridge Rd</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td>Friendly Valley Pkwy</td>
<td>Vista Del Canon</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td>1600’ South of Ryan Ln</td>
<td>550’ NE of Linda Vista St</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Galeton Rd</td>
<td>SR 14 (Antelope Valley Fwy)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Rd</td>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourney Rd</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Pkwy</td>
<td>Valencia Blvd</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Vista Ridge Dr</td>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Bike Lane** 24.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd (WB Only)</td>
<td>Espuela Dr</td>
<td>Alamogordo Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle Rd</td>
<td>Golden Oak Rd</td>
<td>Rainbow Glen Dr</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ave</td>
<td>Pine St</td>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>Lyons Ave</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>Via Pacifica</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Bike Route** 5.4

**TOTAL ON-STREET** 29.8

*Source: City of Santa Clarita GIS*
1.2.2. Sidewalks, Paseos, and Multi-Purpose Trails

Santa Clarita’s existing pedestrian network is comprised of sidewalks, crosswalks, paseos and multi-purpose trails. Sidewalks are walkways running parallel to a roadway while paseos are paved walking paths that provide pedestrian links outside of the street network. Multi-purpose trails as defined in this Plan refer to unpaved trails that are suitable for walkers, hikers, equestrians and mountain bikers, but are not considered bicycle transportation facilities.

Most of Santa Clarita’s major roadways have sidewalks along portions of their length. Recently built sidewalks and sidewalks along some roadways, such as McBean Parkway, are buffered from the vehicle traffic by a planter strip, while sidewalks along older roadways, particularly those constructed by Los Angeles County, are directly adjacent to the vehicle traffic.

Sidewalk connectivity within the suburban residential neighborhoods of Santa Clarita is excellent. In many neighborhoods, sidewalks connect to a system of paseos and may even connect to the longer citywide trail network. Sidewalks are provided in most neighborhood commercial areas. Santa Clarita has increased connectivity by building pedestrian bridges over busy streets and providing sidewalk facilities on bridges.

The Valencia and Saugus neighborhoods of Santa Clarita have well-developed paseo networks linking residential neighborhoods to each other and to surrounding land uses. Paseos provide connections between cul-de-sacs; provide access to schools, neighborhood parks and pools, and to local commercial centers; and in some cases provide access to the citywide trail network.

The City of Santa Clarita currently has 33.7 miles of unpaved multi-purpose trails. The trails are located in rural or semi-rural areas, and generally in the southern and western parts of the City. The multi-purpose trail network includes an equestrian path that parallels the South Fork Trail and one that parallels Sand Canyon Road. Other multi-use trails are located off Oak Springs Canyon Road, north of Placerita Canyon Road, and south of San Fernando Road, parallel to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks. The City has plans to develop approximately 8.3 additional miles of multi-purpose trails. Santa Clarita’s existing multi-purpose trails are listed in Table 1-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Name/Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placerita Canyon Trail</td>
<td>Quigley Canyon</td>
<td>Creekview Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Ranch Trail</td>
<td>Oak Spring Canyon</td>
<td>US Forest</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Trail</td>
<td>Valley Ranch Road</td>
<td>just north or Warmuth Road</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Connector</td>
<td>Auto Center Trailhead</td>
<td>South Fork River</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway</td>
<td>Newhall Creek</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Areas</td>
<td>Auto Center Trailhead</td>
<td>South Fork River</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>Total multi-purpose trails</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3. Bicyclist and Pedestrian Needs

1.3.1. Bicyclist Needs

The needs and preferences of bicyclists vary depending on the skill level of the cyclist and the type of trip the bicyclist is taking. Santa Clarita’s Non-Motorized Transportation Plan considers these differences in planning a system that serves all user types.

Because of its extensive network of trails and bike paths, Santa Clarita offers many good opportunities for casual bicyclists. Many of the City’s trails and paths are accessible from residential roads. Many experienced bicyclists, including those who bicycle long distances for exercise or training, also use the multi-use paths within the City. This combination of fast-moving bicyclists on training rides with slower-moving casual bicyclists and pedestrians may result in user conflicts on the trails. The Plan helps Santa Clarita move in the direction of providing more on-street facilities to provide a variety of training and commuting opportunities for cyclists.

Santa Clarita’s trail system also provides access to shopping and employment opportunities within Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, and along Soledad Canyon Road into Canyon Country—all of which are important to the utilitarian rider. However, not all communities have easy bicycle access to the trail system. For the casual recreational rider, this may not be a serious deterrent, since they be willing and able to drive their bicycle to the trailhead. However, this may not be an option for the experienced recreational rider or the commuter, as they generally would like to use their bicycle for the whole trip. Bicycle-friendly connections between the residential areas and the trails will likely increase in the prevalence of bicycle commuting, as well as increase the prevalence of recreational riding.

1.3.2. Pedestrian Needs

People walk for many reasons: traveling to work, transit or other multi-modal facilities, school, recreation and entertainment, health and exercise, shopping, social events, personal errands, appointments, and social visits. Pedestrian needs for different trip types vary. For example, a commuter may desire a well-connected direct route with efficient signal timing, while a recreational pedestrian may be more concerned about the aesthetics of the surroundings. However, all pedestrians have several needs in common, such as safety, connectivity, and accessibility. Pedestrian mobility networks should also consider persons with disabilities. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandates that reasonable accommodation for access should be provided for those who may need such assistance.

Based on field observations and input provided in the public input process, the most critical needs of pedestrians in Santa Clarita include crossing visibility, continuous facilities, uniform design guidelines, reduced traffic speeds, mixed land uses, and direct connections.

1.3.3. Public Outreach

Public involvement is important to the success of any non-motorized transportation plan. An extensive outreach program was created to solicit input for Santa Clarita’s 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, including an on-line survey, bi-lingual questionnaires, two community meetings, a project-specific website, and press releases and email
announcements. Outreach for the 2012 Plan Update was conducted through focus groups for site-specific improvements. The Old Town Newhall Association and the Valley Industry Association participated in focus groups in September 2012 to provide input on Downtown Newhall and the Valencia Industrial Center respectively.

1.4. Recommendations

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan outlines a range of recommendations to guide Santa Clarita toward the goals of providing bikeways, trails and paseos for all Santa Clarita residents, increasing the number of people who bike and walk for everyday needs, improving safety for bicyclists and pedestrians, and increasing public awareness and positive attitudes about biking and walking in Santa Clarita. Recommendations were developed to reflect public input, existing conditions, and future city plans. The recommendations include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure improvements, safe routes to school programs, design and policy recommendations, complete streets policy recommendations, travel demand management strategies, transit access improvements, funding and implementation strategies, education and encouragement programs, and supportive land use policies. These recommendations are outlined as follows.

1.4.1. Bicycle Infrastructure Improvements

The recommended bicycle network has been developed to build upon the network proposed in the 2008 plan, to fill in gaps within the current network, to continue the expansion of the existing trail network, to formalize existing routes used by cyclists, and to improve access between residential neighborhoods and the current bikeway network. Recommended bikeways are shown on Figure 1-2. The projects reflect the City’s existing and future roadway and trail plans. Key projects include:

- Signing Valley Street, Wiley Canyon Road, and Sierra Highway as bicycle routes.
- Striping bike lanes on Avenue Tibbitts and Whites Canyon Road, and through the Valencia Town Center
- Striping time-restricted bike lanes on Sierra Highway to fill in a network gap
- Bicycle Boulevard on Walnut Street
- Construction of a Class I Path parallel to Railroad Avenue, between Magic Mountain Parkway and Market Street
- Extending the South Fork Trail from Orchard Village Road to Lyons Avenue
- Extending the Santa Clara River Trail from Discovery Park/Calla Way to Five Knolls development
- Creating a Class I and paseo connection through the Valencia Town Center
- Constructing a Class I path along Bouquet Canyon Creek, paralleling Bouquet Canyon Road

In addition to these projects, Class I paths are specified in the construction of several roadways, including the Cross-Valley Connector and the Via Princessa Extension.
1.4.2. Pedestrian Infrastructure Improvements

This Plan provides general design guidelines and best practices for developing pedestrian walkways, recommends a sidewalk gap closure program for the Industrial Center, a high-visibility sidewalk installation program, and identifies pedestrian safety improvements for several key intersections. The intersections were chosen as part of the 2008 based on pedestrian collision history, proximity to existing pedestrian networks, and proximity to commuter destinations. The intersections identified for improvement are:

- McBean Parkway and Creekside Drive
- Lyons Avenue and Peachland Avenue
- Lyons Avenue and Avenida Rotella
- Railroad Avenue and 15th Street (Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail)
- Seco Canyon Road and Bouquet Canyon Road
- Commuter Way and Soledad Canyon Road
- Intersections of Soledad Canyon Road and Golden Oak, Reuther Avenue and Rainbow Glen Drive

1.4.3. Recommended Programs

In addition to the recommended bicycle and pedestrian facilities, the Plan recommends specific programs and policies intended to facilitate planning and designing for bicyclists and pedestrians. The recommendations include events, contests and incentives to encourage people to bike and walk, education programs to teach students and adults bicycle safety, and enforcement strategies to promote safer interactions between drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians. Policy recommendations focus on modifications and additions that would support the development of a city-wide non-motorized transportation network and would encourage people to bike and walk more. Recommended programs are highlighted in Table 1-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Recommended Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education Programs</td>
<td>Motorists and Bicyclists through a Share the Road Campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue and Expand Bicycle and Pedestrian Education Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide Safety Handbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educate Motorists, City Staff, Maintenance and Construction Crews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement Programs</td>
<td>Facilitate the Development of Employer Incentive Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop System Identification and Wayfinding Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a Community Bikeway/Walkway Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a Multi-Modal Access Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Businesses to Develop Incentives for Biking and Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apply for Higher Ranked Bicycle Friendly Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Continue to Support Bike-to-Work and Bike-to-School Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to Support Bike Fairs and Races</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citywide and Regional Coordination</td>
<td>Fund a City Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Focus Area

**Recommended Programs**

- **Pedestrian Facility Improvement Programs**
  - Establish a Sidewalk Gap Closure Program
  - Establish an Intersection Improvement Program

- **Bicycle Parking and End of Trip Facilities**
  - Increase Public Bicycle Parking Facilities
  - Encourage Provision of Shower and Locker Facilities
  - Encourage Provision of Bicycle Air Stations

- **Maintenance and Operations**
  - Develop a Maintenance Policy that Addresses the Special Needs of Bicyclists
  - Consider impacts on bicycles while performing construction, maintenance and repair work on roadways and trails.

- **Signage and Striping**
  - Designated Bikeway Signs
  - Consider a Pilot Program to Test Parallel Path Warning Signage
  - Destination Signage

- **Bicycle Signal Detection**
  - Install Bicycle-Sensitive Loop Detectors at Signalized Intersections
  - Apply Pavement Stenciling above Bicycle-Sensitive Loop Detectors Where Service Must be Actuated by Detection
  - Regularly Calibrate Bicycle-Sensitive Loop Detectors

- **Safety and Security**
  - Increase Safety and Security through Proper Design and Maintenance
  - Bicycle Patrol Unit
  - Continue a Safe Routes to School Program

### 1.4.4. Strategies to Promote Biking and Walking

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan recommends strategies and policies that can be used to promote biking and walking in Santa Clarita. These strategies include:

#### Design Recommendations:

Wider bicycle lanes are recommended on Santa Clarita’s major roadways to provide additional separation between bicyclists and motor vehicles. The Plan discusses ways to determine whether it is most appropriate to use a parallel bicycle path or on-street bicycle lanes, noting that in cases where numerous crossings exist or destinations are along both sides of the road, on-street bicycle facility, such as wide Class II bike lanes, may be more appropriate. The Plan outlines special design considerations for parallel paths to minimize conflicts between crossing motor vehicle traffic and path users and between different user groups on the path. The Plan also includes summaries of federal and state design guidelines for bicycle facilities, and pedestrian facilities.

#### Recommended Policy Modifications:

The Plan recommends several general changes to the City’s Municipal Code and Circulation Element. Modifications may include siting criteria to the bicycle parking ordinance, allowing property owners to substitute bicycle parking for motor vehicle parking and modifying language in the Circulation Element Street Design Guidelines to clarify appropriate locations for parallel Class I facilities versus Class II facilities.

#### Transit Recommendations:

The Plan identifies ways Santa Clarita’s physical infrastructure can be modified to accommodate people who bike and walk to transit. In general, recommendations focus on improving the comfort of pedestrian facilities, creating short and direct connections to transit stops, and improving directional and informational signage.
Travel Demand Management: The Plan includes policies to reduce congestion, such as alternative work schedules, policies to induce a shift from single-occupancy vehicles to higher occupancy vehicles, such as ride matching programs, and policies to shift trips from driving to biking, walking or transit, such as parking fee programs.

Land Use Policies to Promote Biking and Walking: This section offers solutions for increasing bicycle and pedestrian trips through the implementation of land use regulations and policies that encourage pedestrian and bicycle friendly development. Policies include clustering development, mixed uses, increasing non-motorized connectivity, transit oriented development, sidewalk construction requirements, and using development review to ensure new construction is well-designed for biking and walking. Santa Clarita has already been using some of these policies.

1.4.5. Safe Routes to Schools

Safe Routes to School refers to a variety of multi-disciplinary programs aimed at promoting walking and bicycling to school, and improving traffic safety around school areas through education, incentives, increased law enforcement, and engineering measures. The City of Santa Clarita has been successful in working with school districts and parents to identify, fund, and construct infrastructure improvements and implement education and encouragement programs throughout the city.

The City has been working down the prioritized list of schools from the 2008 Plan to apply for grant funding to construct infrastructure improvements. Each grant cycle, three schools are selected—one from each of the three school districts. For six consecutive years, the City has been awarded State or Federal Safe Routes to School funding to implement the infrastructure improvements. Table 1-7 describes the improvements implemented at each school through funding received. This Plan re-prioritizes the remaining schools that have not yet received funding, as well as the middle and high schools so that the City can apply for funding for those schools, as well.

Table 1-7: Summary of Infrastructure Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Walk Audit</th>
<th>Grant Submitted</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Constructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Springs Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedarcreek Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emblem Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
<td>● ● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Walk Audit</td>
<td>Grant Submitted</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks Ranch Elementary School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Oak Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmers Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Foster Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leona Cox Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGrath Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Park Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Orchard Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachland Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinetree Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Canyon Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosedell Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyblue Mesa Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur Springs Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Valley Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4.6. Complete Streets

The Circulation Element, Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, and Transportation Development Plan together provide a good framework for establishing complete streets policies. This Plan provides recommendations for how the City can further strengthen its commitment to complete streets, such as by officially supporting complete streets through a resolution, by passing a complete streets ordinance, by modifying design standards to give equal weight to the needs of all roadway users, and by implementing internal procedures and checklists to support complete streets.

1.5. Funding and Implementing the Plan

1.5.1. Project Prioritization

The intent of prioritizing projects is to identify which high-priority bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be constructed first. As projects are constructed, lower priority projects should be moved up the list.

Prioritization criteria were developed to reflect the transportation benefit, regional connectivity benefit, cost, safety benefit and feasibility of each project. The overall score of a project is the sum of individual criteria. Projects are placed into three phasing groups: Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3.

1.5.2. Cost Estimates

Construction of the recommended bicycle and pedestrian facilities will result in 17.3 miles of new Class I Bike Paths, 5.3 miles of new Class II bike lanes, and 15.7 miles of Class III Bike Routes (not including projects that will be constructed as part of other development projects). Pedestrian facility recommendations include improvements at nine intersections, a sidewalk installation program, and a high-visibility crossing program. The total cost of constructing the recommended bicycle projects is estimated at $31.4 million dollars and the estimated cost of the pedestrian projects is estimated at $6.8 million dollars.¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Cost Per Mile</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bicycle Path</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>$1,400,000²</td>
<td>$30,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bicycle Lane</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$268,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Route - Standard</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$392,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Route – Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>$6,766,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$38,214,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Costs are in 2012 dollars

¹ Unless otherwise noted, cost estimates are based on per-mile averages of bikeway construction in California. Estimates include 15% for survey and design work, 20% for contingency and 20% for construction administration. Cost estimates are in 2012 dollars. Cost estimates are planning level, and do not include feasibility, environmental clearance or acquisition costs. Project-specific factors such as grading, landscaping, intersection modification, right-of-way acquisition, and bridge construction may increase the actual cost of construction, sometimes significantly.

² Based on cost to construct the Iron Horse Trail

Table 1-8: Cost Summary of City-Funded Proposed Improvements
Table 1-9:  
Cost Summary of City-Funded Projects by Project Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$1,686,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$24,068,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$12,460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$38,214,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5.3. Implementation

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan provides the long-term vision for the development of a citywide biking and walking network that can be used by all residents for all types of trips. Implementation of the Plan will take place in small steps over many years. This Plan recommends that the City pursue the following strategies to implement the Plan’s vision:

- **Establish implementation responsibility** by assigning the duties of a non-motorized transportation planner to a City staff person.

- **Strategically implement infrastructure projects** by pursuing funding for high-priority projects first, and by constructing projects of all priorities in conjunction with larger construction projects.

- **Regularly revisit project prioritization** to ensure that new projects are added to the list, completed projects are removed and the priorities are revised as conditions change.

- **Update the Plan** on a regular basis. The bicycle portion of the Plan should be updated every five years to remain eligible for state funding. Other elements of the Plan may be reviewed and updated as needed.

- **Use measures of effectiveness** to determine how well the City is able to implement the Plan. The Plan identifies several measures of effectiveness that the City should consider.

1.6. Contents of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan document can be divided into three parts: Chapters 1-4, Chapters 5-9 and the Appendices. The first four chapters outline the existing bicycling and walking conditions in Santa Clarita. The last five chapters present recommendations to guide the future development of bicycling and walking in the City. The Appendices provide supporting information such as design guidelines for bicycle, pedestrian and trail facilities, guidelines for accommodating bicyclists and pedestrians on transit, and state laws related to bicyclists and pedestrians.

The Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan contains the following chapters:

Chapter 1, **Introduction**, provides an overview of the Plan, the goals and implementation strategies.
Chapter 2, *Existing Conditions*, provides a description of the existing bicycle and pedestrian conditions in Santa Clarita. The chapter includes a map of existing bikeways and paseos as well as descriptions of existing bicycle programs.

Chapter 3, *Planning and Policy Context*, provides an overview of relevant planning documents from the City of Santa Clarita and adjacent jurisdictions.

Chapter 4, *Needs of the Non-Motorized System*, documents the need for bicycle transportation in Santa Clarita, including an overview of existing user groups, bicycle commute statistics, responses to the Biking and Walking Survey, and reported bicycle accident data.

Chapter 5, *Recommended Improvements*, outlines the recommended design guidelines and programs, recommended Bike Route, Bike Lane, Bike Path networks, and intersection improvements, includes a map of existing and recommended bikeways and summary tables of recommended improvements.

Chapter 6, *Strategies to Promote Biking and Walking*, presents general policies that the City should consider to encourage biking and walking.

Chapter 7, *Funding and Implementation*, provides a prioritized list of recommended bikeways with basic cost estimates, a list of potential funding sources, and recommended measures of effectiveness.

Chapter 8, *Safe Routes to School*, outlines ways the City, schools, school districts, parents and law enforcement can collaborate to make it easier and safer to bike and walk to school. The chapter also prioritizes elementary, middle, and high schools for funding and improvements.

Chapter 9, *Complete Streets*, outlines existing complete streets efforts the City is engaging in, as well as recommendations for how the City can further strengthen its commitment to complete streets.
2. **EXISTING CONDITIONS**

This chapter provides a description of existing non-motorized conditions within the City of Santa Clarita. The information provided is based on field visits, the City’s existing maps and planning documents, and meetings with the City staff.

The information is divided into the following sections:

1. **2.1 Setting** describes Santa Clarita’s location and land uses. (Page 2-2)

2. **2.2 Summary of Progress Made** lists the improvements the City has made since adoption of the 2007 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. (Page 2-3)

3. **2.3 Existing Bicycle Facilities** lists Santa Clarita’s existing on- and off-street bicycle facilities, describes major off-street paths, and provides a map of these facilities. This section also describes support facilities, such as bicycle detection and bicycle parking. (Page 2-4)

4. **2.4 Existing Pedestrian Facilities** provides a description and map of the existing pedestrian facilities within the City of Santa Clarita. This section identifies locations with high pedestrian use, describes existing sidewalks and paseos and contains a map of Santa Clarita’s paseos. (Page 2-16)

5. **2.5 Bicycle Facility Maintenance** describes how the City of Santa Clarita maintains its bicycle facilities. (Page 2-19)

6. **2.6 Past Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Expenditures** summarizes the City’s investment in constructing, improving, and maintaining bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure between 2006 and 2011. (Page 2-19)

7. **2.7 Encouragement and Education Programs** describes biking and walking encouragement and education programs currently available in Santa Clarita. (Page 2-21)

8. **2.8 Multi-Modal Connections** describes how bicycles are supported on Santa Clarita’s transit services, including City of Santa Clarita Transit and Metrolink. (Page 2-22)
2.1. Setting

The City of Santa Clarita was incorporated in 1987 from the communities of Canyon Country, Newhall, Saugus and Valencia. It has expanded through multiple annexations and now encompasses over 60 square miles in area and, as of 2013, is home to over 200,000 residents.\(^1\) It is 35 miles north of downtown Los Angeles and bounded generally on the west by Interstate 5 and the east by State Route 14 (SR-14). Located in the Santa Clara River Valley, the City is bounded by the Sierra Pelona Mountain Range to the north and the Santa Susanna and San Gabriel mountain ranges to the south.

The City is located just north of the San Fernando Valley, and is bordered by unincorporated Los Angeles County, including the unincorporated communities of Acton, Agua Dulce, Castaic, and Stevenson Ranch. In 2003, the City of Santa Clarita was the fastest growing city in Los Angeles County, with a growth rate of three percent. Santa Clarita’s population grew by 17.9% from 2000 to 2007—twice the growth experienced in all of Los Angeles County. Population growth was the result of new housing construction in the City as well as annexations of surrounding areas into the city limits. This high growth rate, combined with high growth in the surrounding communities and the large area of the City, has placed increasing transportation pressures on the community. The growth of the City provides opportunities for expanding the existing bicycle and pedestrian network.

Development in Santa Clarita is generally suburban in character, with most development occurring on the valley floor and lower canyons. The City is mostly residential, with low-density single-family residential areas located throughout, commercial areas located along major arterials, business parks located primarily along Interstate 5 and along Soledad Canyon Road, and neighborhood commercial centers scattered throughout the City.

The Santa Clara River provides open space for the residents of Santa Clarita.

The City continues to grow. Recent development includes residential units, as well as community facilities, such as the Old Town Newhall Library and Canyon Country Community Center. Parks and open spaces are interspersed throughout the City.

The four communities (Canyon Country, Newhall, Saugus and Valencia) which were joined together to form Santa Clarita still have distinct characteristics, and land uses for each community are described below.

**Canyon Country** contains a variety of housing types, including large-lot single-family custom homes, single-family tract homes, and multi-family development and mobile home parks. Neighborhood serving commercial areas are concentrated along Soledad Canyon Road and Sierra Highway. Sand Canyon, a sub-community of Canyon Country, is located south of SR-14 and consists of very low-density single-family homes and estates. The community is rural, and characterized by larger lot sizes. Most streets in the neighborhood do not have sidewalks. The neighborhood is home to several horse ranches, and equestrian use is common.

\(^1\) 2010 U.S. Census
**Newhall** was developed in 1876 in conjunction with the construction of the Southern Pacific Railroad. As the oldest permanent settlement in the City, Newhall's circulation pattern and land use are conducive to walking and biking. The area east of Newhall Avenue and north of Lyons Avenue has a grid network of streets and high-density single and multi-family residential units. South of Lyons Avenue, the neighborhood is less dense. Downtown Newhall is governed by a specific plan, which is discussed in the next chapter. Since adoption of the Downtown Newhall Specific Area Plan, the City has converted San Fernando Road into Main Street (Lyons Avenue to 5th Street) into a pedestrian-oriented downtown street. The City reduced the number of travel lanes on Main Street (San Fernando Road) to two and installed angled on-street parking, curb extensions, and street trees. The Specific Plan proposes redeveloping Downtown Newhall as a transit-oriented mixed-use district and the City has begun efforts toward achieving this goal. Placerita Canyon, located to the northeast of downtown Newhall, is a rural sub-community of Newhall, and is home to several equestrian-oriented residential areas.

**Saugus** is primarily single-family residential and home to several newer residential developments. Smaller community commercial and neighborhood serving commercial areas are dispersed throughout. Saugus was developed in the 1970s and 1980s with typical auto-oriented neighborhoods.

**Valencia** was developed as a planned community starting in the 1960s and 70s. It includes single-family residential neighborhoods supported by local recreational amenities and community shopping centers. A system of off-street pedestrian pathways (paseos) links the residential, recreational and commercial areas. Pedestrian bridges cross major arterials. Key destinations include Santa Clarita City Hall, Valencia Town Center shopping mall, the Henry Mayo Newhall Hospital, College of the Canyons and California Institute of the Arts. Magic Mountain theme park, a regional recreational destination, is located adjacent in an area of Valencia that is in unincorporated Los Angeles County.

### 2.2. Progress Made Since Adoption of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

The City of Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan was adopted on June 24, 2008. Since adoption, the City has worked diligently to implement recommendations from the Plan. Table 2-1 provides a summary of the progress the City has made since Plan adoption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Paths</td>
<td>The City constructed 4.0 miles of bike paths, including portions of the Newhall Ranch Bike Path and Santa Clara River Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>The City striped 11.4 miles of bike lanes, including facilities on 16” Street, Tournament Road, Decoro Drive, Tourney Road, Centre Pointe Parkway, Rockwell Canyon, and through the Valencia Industrial Center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bike Routes</td>
<td>The City added 2.9 miles of bike routes on Orchard Village Road and Golden Triangle Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Trails</td>
<td>The City expanded its multi-purpose trail network, including a trail south of the Santa Clara River between the Iron Horse and Promenade trailheads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailheads</td>
<td>The City completed the Iron Horse Trailhead, providing new access to the Santa Clara River Trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Countdown Signals</td>
<td>The City upgraded all of its signals to have pedestrian countdown signals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Safe Routes to School (Infrastructure)

The City installed pedestrian improvements at 21 schools between 2008 and 2012.

### Safe Routes to School (Non-Infrastructure)

The City implemented a Safe Routes to School Program including all 26 elementary schools between 2008 and 2010.

### Programs

The City continued its Bike to Work Day Challenge and hosted additional events for the Amgen Bike Tour of California. Trail maps were installed at six existing trailheads through a grant.

## 2.3. Existing Bicycle Facilities

The City of Santa Clarita’s existing bikeway network consists of approximately 36.4 miles of off-street bicycle paths, 24.4 miles of bike lanes, and 5.4 miles of bike routes.

This Plan refers to bikeways using Caltrans standard designations. The three types of bikeways identified by Caltrans in Chapter 1000 of the Highway Design Manual are defined below. Figure 2-1 illustrates the three types of bikeways.

**Class I Bikeway:** Typically called a “bike path,” a Class I Bikeway provides bicycle travel on a paved right-of-way completely separated from any street or highway.2

**Class II Bikeway:** Often referred to as a “bike lane,” a Class II Bikeway provides a striped and stenciled lane for one-way travel on a street or highway.

**Class III Bikeway:** Generally referred to as a “bike route,” a Class III Bikeway provides for shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic and is identified only by signing. Additional shared lane markings can be used to supplement Class III Bikeways to further highlight the presence of bicyclists to motorists.

Santa Clarita’s existing bicycle network is shown in Figure 2-2 (see page 2-11). The network consists primarily of Class I off-street paths and Class II on-street bike lanes. Class III bike routes are designated on Bouquet Canyon Road, Wiley Canyon Road, Orchard Village Road, Golden Triangle Road, and Newhall Avenue. Bike paths run parallel to the Santa Clara River and its tributaries, and parallel to major roads, including Soledad Canyon Road and McBean Parkway.

### 2.3.1. Paved Off-Street Bike Paths

The City of Santa Clarita has an extensive network of paved, off-street bike paths and trails. These paved bike paths should not be confused with the city’s unpaved “multi-purpose trails” (discussed in Section 2.3) which are not considered bicycle transportation facilities according to Caltrans. This section refers only to paved bike paths that meet the Caltrans definition of a Class I bike facility.

---

2 Multi-use paths are generally not recommended for use by electronic bicycles due to the speed differential between electronic bicycles and non-motorized users.
**CLASS I**  
**Multi-Use Path**  
Provides a completely separated right of way for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians with crossflow minimized.

**CLASS II**  
**Bike Lane**  
Provides a striped lane for one-way bike travel on a street or highway.

**CLASS III**  
**Bike Route**  
**Signed Shared Roadway**  
Provides for shared use with pedestrian or motor vehicle traffic, typically on lower volume roadways.

Figure 2-1: Caltrans Bikeway Classifications
The first bike paths built in the City generally followed the Santa Clara River and its tributaries. Newer paths have been developed that connect residential neighborhoods to the river paths. The network provides connections to the Santa Clarita Metrolink Station, several schools, businesses along Soledad Canyon Road and McBean Parkway, and to recreational opportunities along the rivers. The City typically provides grade-separated undercrossings where a Class I bike path crosses a major highway.

Major paths include the South Fork Trail, along a south tributary of the Santa Clara River; the Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail, along Soledad Canyon Road; the Santa Clara River Trail; the San Francisquito Creek Trail; the bike path along Newhall Ranch Road; and the path along Golden Valley Road. Some paths, such as South Fork, are recreational in nature, and are part of a combined pedestrian-equestrian-bicycle trail corridor. Other paths, such as the Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail, are more commuter-oriented and run parallel to major roadways. Descriptions of the major path segments follow. Shorter paths are not described, but are shown on the map of existing bikeways and included in the mileage count.

**South Fork Trail**
The South Fork Trail is a bike path that parallels the south fork of the Santa Clara River for over five miles. For most of its length, the bike path parallels a fenced, unpaved equestrian trail. The bike path runs north from Orchard Village Road and connects to trails along the Santa Clara River and San Francisquito Creek as well as the Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail. There are several access points to the trail from the Valencia paseos and an official trailhead at Magic Mountain Parkway.

**Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail**
The Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail parallels Soledad Canyon Road from Magic Mountain Parkway to just east of the Santa Clara River at Camp Plenty Road. It is approximately five miles long. It serves the Santa Clarita Metrolink Station. The trail connects the eastern and western portions of the Santa Clara River Trail and essentially serves as the Santa Clara River Trail through the center of the City. The western portion of the path runs to the north of Soledad Canyon Road; the path crosses at Golden Oak Road and continues on the south side of Soledad Canyon Road. For part of its length, the bike path is paralleled by separate pedestrian facilities.

**Santa Clarita River Trail**
The Santa Clarita River Trail, when fully built, will parallel the entire length of the Santa Clara River as it runs through the City of Santa Clarita. Currently, three sections are built: McBean Parkway to Bouquet Canyon Road (two miles), Canyon View...
Access to Lost Canyon Road (three miles), and Tree Farm to The Old Road (one mile), which was implemented since adoption of the 2006 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Undercrossings and access points to the road are provided where the trail crosses major roadways.

**San Francisquito Creek Trail**
San Francisquito Creek Trail parallels both sides of the San Francisquito Creek, a tributary of the Santa Clara River. On the west bank, the trail runs 3.7 miles from the Santa Clara River Trail north to Copper Hill Drive. On the east bank, the trail runs 3.1 miles from the Santa Clara River Trail to Copper Hill Drive. Since the 2006 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the City has constructed an additional access point to the trail on the west bank at Decoro Drive.

**Newhall Ranch Road Bike Path**
This bike path runs along the north side of Newhall Ranch road from just east of the I-5 to Soledad Canyon Road. The existing path runs for seven miles. Pedestrians are separated from the bike path by striping. This path was extended with the construction of the Cross Valley Connector, which was completed in 2010.

**Golden Valley Road Bike Path**
This bike path runs along Golden Valley Road between Soledad Canyon Road and east of Highway 14, connecting with multi-use paths in the Golden Valley Open Space. It is located on the east side of Golden Valley Road. There is a section of proposed pathway across Highway 14 that has not yet been implemented. In total there are over three miles of paved pathway. The route includes a long, steep hill.

The City’s existing bike paths are listed in Table 2-2. Connections to the City bike path network are provided at most major roadway intersections. In addition to these connection points, the City maintains six trailheads, and has plans to develop three more trailheads as additional trails are developed. Trailheads are listed below in Table 2-3.
### Table 2-2: Existing Class I Bike Paths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auto Center Dr</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail (N of Cinema Dr)</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail (S of Cinema Dr)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail</td>
<td>Auto Center Dr Trailhead</td>
<td>Camp Plenty Road</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Dr Path</td>
<td>Rye Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Decoro Dr</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faircliff Rd Path</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Seco Canyon Rd</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Rd Path</td>
<td>Golden Valley Rd Path - 330’ east of 3R-14</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Pkwy Path</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path - I-5</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path - Soledad Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd Path - Connector</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd - 0.5 miles S of Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Ridge Dr</td>
<td>Arbor Hill Wy</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisquito Creek Trail</td>
<td>San Francisquito Creek Trail - east side</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>San Francisquito Creek Trail - west side</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Rd</td>
<td>530’ N of Thompson Ranch Dr</td>
<td>270’ S of Thompson Ranch Dr</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail - Soledad Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Santa Clara River</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree Farm</td>
<td>The Old Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canyon View Access</td>
<td>Lost Canyon Rd</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>South Fork Trail Connector</td>
<td>South Fork Path</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Fork Trail - Valencia Boulevard</td>
<td>Tree Farm</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway Trailhead</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Via Pacifica</td>
<td>Claibourne Ln</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL MILES</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>36.4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Santa Clarita Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department, June 2012.
### Table 2-3: Existing Trailheads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Provides Access To</th>
<th>Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iron Horse Trailhead</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway and Tourney Road</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Automobile and horse trailer parking, equestrian staging area, shade structure, information kiosk and drinking fountain on site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promenade Trailhead</td>
<td>Creekside Rd and McBean Parkway</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Automobile parking, near shopping center and eating establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trailhead</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Blvd between Valencia Blvd and Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Automobile and horse trailer parking, picnic tables, drinking fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon Trailhead</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Rd at Lost Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>Automobile parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Plenty Road Trailhead</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Rd at Camp Plenty Rd</td>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Trail, Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>Automobile parking, drinking fountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Center Trailhead</td>
<td>Valencia Blvd at Auto Center Dr</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Off-street parking, drinking fountains, shade structure, informational kiosk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2-2: Existing Bicycle Facilities and Trails
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### 2.3.2. Existing On-Street Bike Lanes and Routes

Several of Santa Clarita’s major roadways are striped with Class II bike lanes. There are also three signed Class III bike routes within the City. Existing on-street bicycle facilities are presented below in **Table 2-4**.

**Table 2-4:**
**Existing On-Street Bicycle Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16th St</td>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>Newhall Ave</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Scott</td>
<td>Rye Canyon Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Stanford – Vanderbilt Wy</td>
<td>Ave Scott</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Rd</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Alamogordo Rd</td>
<td>Steve Jon St</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd (EB Only)</td>
<td>Esquina Dr</td>
<td>Alamogordo Rd</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calgrove Blvd</td>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Creekside Dr</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center Pointe Pkwy</td>
<td>Golden Triangle Rd</td>
<td>Ruether Ave</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constellation Rd</td>
<td>Hercules St</td>
<td>Kelly Johnson Pkwy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Seco Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Haskell Canyon Rd</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoror Dr</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Vista Delgado Dr</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockweiler Dr</td>
<td>Ivy Ln</td>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haskell Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hercules St – Kelly Johnson Pkwy</td>
<td>Constellation Rd</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jason Drive</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>Canyon Park Blvd</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell Canyon Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>Valencia Blvd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seco Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Copper Hill Dr</td>
<td>Tupele Ridge Rd</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Galeton Rd</td>
<td>SR 14 (Antelope Valley Fwy)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Rd</td>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourney Rd</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Pkwy</td>
<td>Valencia Blvd</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Vista Ridge Dr</td>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Bike Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bike Lane</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>24.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Rd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bouquet Canyon Rd</strong></td>
<td><strong>Bouquet Canyon Rd</strong></td>
<td><strong>Esquina Dr</strong></td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bouquet Canyon Rd (WB Only)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Esquina Dr</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alamogordo Rd</strong></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Triangle Rd</td>
<td>Golden Oak Rd</td>
<td>Rainbow Glen Dr</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ave</td>
<td>Pine St</td>
<td>Sierra Hwy</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>McBean Pkwy</td>
<td>Lyons Ave</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Rd</td>
<td>Orchard Village Rd</td>
<td>Via Pacifica</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Bike Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bike Route</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>5.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** City of Santa Clarita GIS

**TOTAL ON-STREET** **29.8**
2.3.3. Bikeway Signage

Bikeway signage includes signs identifying a bike route, lane or path to cyclists and drivers (e.g., “Bike Lane” signs posted along a roadway with a bike lane), signs providing regulations or warnings to cyclists or drivers (e.g., bicycle-sized “STOP” signs on trails) and signs providing wayfinding to cyclists (e.g., trailhead signage or bike route numbering).

In Santa Clarita, most on-street facilities have standard Caltrans bikeway signage, and some trail facilities have entrance monuments. Off-street bike paths have standard regulatory signage. Though regulatory signage is well provided on Santa Clarita’s bikeways, there is currently no directional signage provided on on-street facilities or off-street trails. Warning signage for motorists at bikeway-roadway crossings is rare. Most local street connections, continuous bikeway routes and destinations are not identified. Wayfinding can be challenging on trails that do not parallel roads, since cross streets and familiar landmarks cannot be used as reference points. In 2009, the City received a grant to develop wayfinding signage for its trails. The project is expected to begin in 2014.

2.3.4. Bicycle Signal Detection

The City of Santa Clarita currently uses a combination of video detection and in-pavement loop detectors to activate traffic signals. Video detection and loop detectors are calibrated to detect bicyclists. Loop detectors are in-pavement wire sensors that activate traffic signals when a vehicle is positioned over the loop. They work by sensing the metal in the vehicle. Several types of loop detectors can be adjusted to be sensitive enough to sense when a bicycle has stopped over the loop, and thus allow a bicyclist to activate a traffic signal. As of September 2009, Caltrans policy directive 09-06 requires jurisdictions to provide bicycle detection on all new and modified approaches to traffic-actuated signals in the state of California.

Since heavy vehicle traffic and road construction can damage pavement and loop detectors, the City has installed video detection at intersections with high volumes of traffic. Currently, 58 locations in the City use video detection. A vehicle is detected when it enters a preset detection boundary within the camera’s view. Video detection systems can be modified to identify bicyclists as well as motor vehicles. The City plans to continue to use a combination of loop-detector and video detection systems.
2.3.5. Bicycle Parking

Santa Clarita provides bicycle racks and lockers at major transit stops, parks and at City Hall. Several major employers also provide bicycle parking for employees. Bicycle parking is required for office, commercial, industrial and multi-family residential uses through the Unified Development Code. A list of major bicycle parking locations are provided in Table 2-6.

Table 2-5:
Santa Clarita’s Existing Bicycle Parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Type of Parking</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Metrolink Station</td>
<td>34 locker spaces</td>
<td>26 rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Princessa Metrolink Station</td>
<td>10 locker spaces</td>
<td>3 rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Heidt (Newhall) Metrolink Station</td>
<td>22 locker spaces</td>
<td>6 rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Hall</td>
<td>6 locker spaces/bike racks</td>
<td>5 rented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Regional Transit Center</td>
<td>10 bike lockers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>82 locker spaces</strong></td>
<td><strong>46 rented</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Community Center</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Sports Complex</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City parks</td>
<td>Bike racks at all parks except Chesebrough Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Flags Magic Mountain</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td>provides changing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Town Center</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of the Canyons</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of the Arts</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Master’s College</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td>provides changing facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Maintenance Facility</td>
<td>Bike racks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Santa Clarita, phone survey of Santa Clarita’s major employers, June 2012*
2.4. Existing Pedestrian Facilities

Pedestrian facilities support the safe and convenient travel of people walking, as well as those using wheelchairs, scooters, and segways. This section presents existing pedestrian facilities in Santa Clarita.

2.4.1. Existing Sidewalks, Paseos and Multi-Purpose Trails

Santa Clarita’s existing pedestrian network is comprised of sidewalks, crosswalks, paseos and multi-purpose trails. Sidewalks are defined as walkways running parallel to a roadway while paseos are paved walking paths that provide pedestrian links outside of the street network. Crosswalks are considered an extension of the sidewalk across the roadway. Multi-purpose trails as defined in this Plan refer to unpaved trails that are suitable for walkers, hikers, equestrians and mountain bikers, but are not considered bicycle transportation facilities according to the Caltrans definition (see Section 2.3).

Sidewalk Design

Most of Santa Clarita’s major roadways have sidewalks along portions of their length. Recently built sidewalks and sidewalks along some roadways, such as McBean Parkway, are buffered from the vehicle traffic by a planter strip, while sidewalks along other roadways, such as Soledad Canyon Road, are directly adjacent to the vehicle traffic. In some cases, sidewalk facilities are adjacent to Class I bike paths and either separated from the bike paths by striping (as on Newhall Ranch Road and McBean Parkway) or are separated by landscaping (as on sections of Soledad Canyon Road).

Sidewalk Connectivity

Sidewalk connectivity within the suburban residential neighborhoods of Santa Clarita is excellent. In many neighborhoods, sidewalks connect to a system of paseos and may even connect to the longer citywide trail network. Sidewalks are provided in most neighborhood commercial areas. Santa Clarita has increased connectivity by building pedestrian bridges over busy streets and providing sidewalk facilities on bridges. However, there are some gaps in the network, particularly in areas that were annexed from unincorporated Los Angeles County. Sidewalks may not be provided along some arterial streets and in general, the industrial area and rural roads do not include sidewalks.
Crosswalks and Intersections
Crosswalk markings provide guidance for pedestrians who are crossing roadways by defining and delineating paths across intersections or other crossing points. In Santa Clarita, major intersections are striped with standard “transverse” crosswalks (two parallel lines). Signalized intersections have pedestrian push buttons to actuate walk signals. At intersections, the walk signal must be actuated by a pedestrian to turn on. Every signalized intersection in the City has countdown pedestrian signals to inform the pedestrian the time remaining to cross the street.

Paseos
The Valencia neighborhood of Santa Clarita has well-developed paseo networks linking residential neighborhoods to each other and to surrounding land uses. A map of paseos can be seen in Figure 2-3. Paseos provide connections between cul-de-sacs; provide access to schools, neighborhood parks and pools; and to local commercial centers; and in some cases provide access to the citywide trail network. The paseos are well-landscaped, quiet, paved paths that wind from street to street. Residential yards are separated from the paseos by walls. Most paseos have lighting. Signage on some paseos identifies nearby streets. Access to nearby major streets is limited in some paseo networks. In some cases, a development that has a paseo system will not have sidewalks on adjacent major roads.
Figure 2.3: Existing Paseos
**Multi-Purpose Trails**

The City of Santa Clarita currently has 33.7 miles of multi-purpose trails. These trails are unpaved and are intended for hiking and horseback riding. The trails are located in rural or semi-rural areas, and generally in the southern and western parts of the City. The multi-purpose trail network includes an equestrian path that parallels the South Fork Trail and one that parallels Sand Canyon Road. Other multi-use trails are located off Oak Springs Canyon Road, north of Placerita Canyon Road, south of Newhall Avenue (parallel to the Union Pacific Railroad tracks), and in open space areas. The City has plans to develop approximately 8.3 additional miles of multi-purpose trails. Santa Clarita's existing multi-purpose trails are listed in **Table 2-7** and shown in **Figure 2-2**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trail Name/Location</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Placerita Canyon Trail</td>
<td>Quigley Canyon</td>
<td>Creekview Park</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson Ranch Trail</td>
<td>Oak Spring Canyon</td>
<td>US Forest</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Trail</td>
<td>Valley Ranch Road</td>
<td>just north or Warmuth Road</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Connector</td>
<td>Auto Center Trailhead</td>
<td>South Fork River</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway</td>
<td>Newhall Creek</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total multi-purpose trails</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>33.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Parks, Recreation and Community Services Department, July 2006.*

### 2.5. Bicycle Facility Maintenance

Santa Clarita's on-street bikeways are maintained as part of regular street maintenance activities by the Environmental Services Division of the Public Works Department. Streets are swept weekly, bi-weekly, or monthly depending on location and time of year. Off-street trails are maintained by the Parks, Recreational and Community Services Department. The Parks department is responsible for safety, collecting trash, maintaining landscaping, irrigation, dianaremoving graffiti, repairing fence, asphalt, and any vandalized items. The Public Works department is responsible for sweeping trails and tree maintenance. Residents may also volunteer with the City to help with the upkeep of the trail system.

### 2.6. Past Bicycle and Pedestrian Facility Expenditures

Between 2005 and 2011, the City of Santa Clarita spent approximately $5.6 million on projects which include bicycle facilities. These are listed in **Table 2-8, Past Bicycle Expenditures (2006-2011).**
## Past Bicycle Expenditures (2006-2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012 Bike Facilities</td>
<td>Design and construction of Class II bicycle lanes and Class III bicycle routes</td>
<td>Tourney Rd, Orchard Village Road, Golden Triangle Road, and Centre Pointe Parkway</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Center Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Design and construction of Class II bicycle lanes</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Way, Avenue Stanford, and Avenue Scott</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>$175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decoro Drive Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Design and construction of Class II bicycle lanes</td>
<td>Decoro Drive from McBean Parkway to Vista Delgado Drive</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th Street Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Design and construction of Class II bicycle lanes.</td>
<td>16th Street from Orchard Village Road to Newhall Avenue</td>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Road Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Design and construction of Class II bicycle lanes</td>
<td>Tournament Road from McBean Parkway to Wiley Canyon Road</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockwell Canyon Road Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Design and construction of Class II bicycle lanes</td>
<td>Rockwell Canyon Road from Valencia Blvd to McBean Parkway</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>Construction of Class I bicycle path.</td>
<td>Vanderbilt Way to Dickason Drive</td>
<td>2006-2007</td>
<td>$2,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon River Park</td>
<td>Development of trailhead improvements at existing terminus of Santa Clarita River trail.</td>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$337,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Trail PH II</td>
<td>Design and construction of trail along Sand Canyon Road.</td>
<td>Sand Canyon Road from Live Oak Springs Road, north to Roadrunner Street</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$168,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon View Regional Trail Access</td>
<td>Design and construction of the Santa Clara River Trail.</td>
<td>From Camp Plenty Road to the future river park site</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$782,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Road Bike Trail</td>
<td>Design of a bicycle trail.</td>
<td>Along Golden Valley Road from Sports Complex to Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$16,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Road Bridge over Santa</td>
<td>Construct a bridge over the Santa Clara River. Improvements include a Class I bicycle path.</td>
<td>Golden Valley Road - Cross Valley Connector</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$988,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clara river</td>
<td></td>
<td>Newhall Avenue between Railroad Avenue. and Sierra Highway</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$289,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Avenue/Sierra Hwy Circulation</td>
<td>Modify medians and traffic signal system, remove existing striping and re-stripe roadways with new lane configuration. Project was expanded to include bicycle facilities.</td>
<td>Newhall Avenue between Railroad Avenue. and Sierra Highway</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$289,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Commuter Trail</td>
<td>Design and construction of Segment I of the Santa Clara River Trail.</td>
<td>Terminus of Fairways Drive to Interstate 5</td>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>$402,776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** $5,863,339
2.7. Encouragement and Education Programs

The City of Santa Clarita has been supporting education and encouragement programs for several years and was designated in 2007 by the League of American Bicyclists as a Bicycle Friendly Community at the Bronze Level.

In 2006-2007, as part of the development of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the City of Santa Clarita worked with parents and teachers at four elementary schools to identify infrastructure improvements that could improve walking and biking conditions. The City then received a federal grant to develop a pilot education and encouragement program at four pilot schools, and to conduct walk audits at all of the City’s 26 elementary schools. That program was implemented between 2008 and 2011. As a result of the work conducted, the City has been successful in getting state and federal grant funds to construct infrastructure improvements at 21 schools. More detail on the Safe Routes to School program is provided in Chapter 8.

The City has sponsored a free bicyclist safety program since 1996. The program includes videos and a presentation on the general rules of the road, and tips on how bicyclists and motor vehicles can safely share the road. The program is available by request to businesses, schools and other organizations.

The City also supports an annual Bike to Work Day in May, with city-sponsored pit stops for cyclists that include refreshments, information, and giveaways. City of Santa Clarita Transit provides free bus rides to bicyclists on Bike-to-Work Day. In 2012, the City held its ninth annual Bike to Work Day Challenge, in which businesses with the highest number of employees biking to work receive prizes.

The City also maintains a trails network website. The website includes:

- Map of trails and paseos
- Bicycle safety and use of trails
- Description of trail classifications
- Trail closure notices
- Phone numbers for trail maintenance, volunteering and emergency numbers
- Trail etiquette
- A list of trailheads with location maps and car parking availability
- Phone number for bike locker rental at Metrolink

Santa Clarita has sponsored bicycle education classes for over a decade.

Santa Clarita’s Trails Website provides valuable up-to-date information about City trails.
The Non-motorized Transportation Plan website was developed within the City’s website to keep the public informed of the Plan development and to solicit suggestions and comments from the public. It includes:

- A list of current projects
- Safe Routes to Schools Pilot program information
- Meeting announcements and summaries
- Survey results
- Documents and Maps
- Related links

**Sheriff’s Department**

In 2002, the City, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (which serves as local law enforcement for Santa Clarita) and the local school districts established School Valet Programs at most elementary schools in Santa Clarita. The program uses the 5th and 6th grade students as valets to open the car doors of arriving students in a specially designed drop-off area. The drop-off area allows 10 to 15 cars at a time to enter, drop off and leave in as little as 55 seconds. Fourth grade students assist as escorts or walkers. These students walk the younger ones to their classroom or a line up area so the parents do not have to park and escort their children onto the campus. The program has dramatically reduced traffic congestion around the schools, and improved safety for students who choose to walk and bicycle to schools. Though this program is focused on improving drop-off conditions, it is necessary to have an orderly drop-off so that parents will feel comfortable allowing their children to walk or bicycle to school.

**Amgen Bike Tour of California**

In 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, and 2013 the City of Santa Clarita hosted a segment of the Amgen Bike Tour of California. As part of these events, the City has hosted additional special events, including pre-race criteria, school assemblies, fundraising events, kids rides, kids parades, galas, essay contests, community cycling fair, keynote cycling speaking engagements and bicycle safety classes.

**Local Bicycle Community**

Santa Clarita has an active local bicycle community that sponsors rides, races and other bicycle-related events, such as the Chuck Pontius Criterium and the Santa Clarita Century. Groups include Santa Clarita Velo and the local branch of the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition.

**2.8. Multi-Modal Connections**

Multi-modal refers to the use of two or more modes of transportation in a single trip (i.e., bicycling and riding the bus or train). This section describes bicycle-transit connections. Linking bicycles with Santa Clarita’s mass transit
effectively increases the distance cyclists can travel, provides options in the event of a bicycle breakdown or collision, and gives cyclists alternatives to riding at night or in hot or inclement weather.

Making an effective multi-modal connection consists of three key elements:

- providing bicycle parking facilities at transit stops and bike racks or storage on trains and buses
- improving bikeways that link with transit facilities and stops
- encouraging the use of bicycles on transit through education and encouragement programs

2.8.1. Metrolink

Santa Clarita is served by Metrolink’s Antelope Valley Line, which provides commuter rail service to the San Fernando Valley, downtown Los Angeles and Palmdale/Lancaster. Metrolink has space for two bicycles per rail car. Bicycles are allowed on trains at all times, however, a conductor may require a bicyclist to relocate to another car or wait for another train due to crowding. Three Metrolink stations are within the City of Santa Clarita: Jan Heidt Newhall Station, Santa Clarita Station and Via Princessa Station. Bicycle lockers with space for 10 to 34 bicycles are provided at all three Metrolink stations, as detailed in Table 2-4. Bicycle connections to the Santa Clarita station are provided by the Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail, which parallels Soledad Canyon Road. Jan Heidt Newhall Station is close to the South Fork Trail, and access between the trail and the station is possible along a on Railroad Avenue and other low-traffic residential streets. The Via Princessa Station does not have direct bicycle access, though there are bike lanes on Sierra Highway approaching the station from the south and the Santa Clara River Trail is to the north of the station.

2.8.2. City of Santa Clarita Transit

City of Santa Clarita Transit operates eight local bus lines, two weekday-only station link lines that connect to the Metrolink Stations and seven commuter lines that serve commuters in Santa Clarita and residents commuting from Santa Clarita to Warner Center, San Fernando Valley, West Los Angeles and Downtown Los Angeles. Additional local and commuter routes are planned as noted in the Transportation Development Plan.

As of July 2006, all local buses are equipped with bicycle racks that hold two or three bicycles. The City sponsors a public outreach campaign that includes video instructions for loading bicycles on the racks, and provides buses with racks at city-sponsored events to allow people to practice loading bicycles on bus racks. Commuter buses have under-bus storage that holds bicycles.

Bicycle racks, lockers and restrooms are provided at the McBean Regional Transit Center, located at the corner of McBean Parkway and Valencia Boulevard. Bicycle lockers are available at the Via Princessa Metrolink Station, the Jan Heidt Newhall Metrolink Station and the Santa Clarita Metrolink Station. Bicycle racks are not available at local bus stops.
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3. **PLANNING AND POLICY CONTEXT**

This chapter provides a summary of planning and policy documents from Santa Clarita that are relevant to the development of the City of Santa Clarita’s Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Plans and policies are considered relevant if they directly address non-motorized transportation facilities, or if they address land-use patterns that affect non-motorized transportation. The chapter consists of the following sections:

3.1. **Summary of Existing Plans** summarizes relevant Santa Clarita plans, and provides specific policies related to biking and walking in the City. (Page 3-1)

3.2. **Regional Plans** summarizes the regional plans that are relevant to the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. (Page 3-13)

3.3. **Major Development Projects** provides an overview of development projects and land use plans that are relevant to biking and walking in the City. (Page 3-16)

### 3.1. Summary of Existing Plans

In 1992, the City of Santa Clarita adopted Resolution 92-102, reaffirming that the City “vigorously support[s] bicycle use within the City limits on both roads and off road bikeways.” Since that resolution, many of the City’s plans and policies have addressed bicycle planning.

#### 3.1.1. Santa Clarita Valley General Plan

The City of Santa Clarita has joined with the County of Los Angeles to prepare a unified General Plan for the Santa Clarita Valley. The General Plan aims to provide guidelines for future growth and preservation of natural resources in the Valley, by updating the General Plans of Santa Clarita and the County of Los Angeles’ unincorporated areas together. The project began in 2001 with a series of workshops and community events intended to gather input from the public regarding the plan. The City completed the General Plan in 2011.

#### 3.1.1.1. Circulation Element

The Circulation Element of the General Plan addresses mobility within Santa Clarita and connections to the surrounding areas. The Circulation Element has been developed in conformance with regional transportation programs, including those of the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans); the Regional Mobility Plan prepared by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG); the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority’s (MTA or MTA or...
Metro) Congestion Management Program and bikeway strategic plan; Santa Clarita Transit’s Transportation Development Plan (TDP); and Los Angeles County’s Airport Land Use Plan.

Because of the expected growth within the Santa Clarita Valley (estimated by the Congestion Management Program for Los Angeles County) and the growing concern about traffic congestion, a major component of the Circulation Element is promotion of non-motorized travel modes, including bikeways and walkways. Promoting safe non-motorized transportation will lead to the development of a healthy and safe circulation system for the Valley. Trails and bikeways are also addressed in the Conservation and Open Space Element.

The Circulation Element lists the following needs related to non-motorized transportation that led to the development of goals and policies:

- Reduce congestion and vehicle miles traveled by managing transportation systems and travel demand
- Plan for and implement a regional bikeway network, to meet both recreational and non-motorized travel needs
- Make the Santa Clarita Valley a walkable community, by retrofitting pedestrian connections and facilities into existing development where needed, and by promoting healthy streets in new development
- Contribute to a regional reduction in greenhouse gas emissions through land use planning and transportation strategies.

Many goals, objectives, and policies within the Circulation Element highlight the importance of bicycling and walking. Table 3-1 presents the broad themes of these goals, objectives, and policies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Plan Guiding Principles that Support Biking and Walking</th>
<th>Summary of Guiding Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth Management</strong></td>
<td>Target higher-density development and mixed-use projects next to existing and planned transit corridors and activity centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage neighborhood-scale development that includes mixed density of housing units consistent with community character.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Create a sense of neighborhood in urbanized areas by promoting walkability and developing neighborhood activity centers such as schools, parks, multi-purpose facilities, convenience centers and neighborhood commercial centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use</strong></td>
<td>Minimize the dependence on, and prominence and area dedicated to the automobile.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Include pedestrian linkages, landscaped parkways and green corridors, and separated trails where appropriate and feasible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3-1
3. Planning and Policy Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Guiding Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a unified and well-maintained network of highways, streets, bikeways and pedestrian paths within Santa Clarita Valley and to regional activity centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a continuous bikeway network to provide circulation within each community, to connect each community, and to provide access to surrounding open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognize that trails are an important recreational asset that, when connected to the regional transportation system, can improve mobility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a continuous and unified hiking and equestrian trail network with unified design standards to unify the Santa Clarita Valley Communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Policies that are directly related to bicycling and walking are listed in Table 3-2.

Table 3-2
Circulation Element Bikeways and Pedestrian Circulation Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.1.1</strong></td>
<td>For recreational riders, continue to develop Class I bike paths, separated from the right-of-way, linking neighborhoods to open space and activity areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.1.2</strong></td>
<td>For long-distance riders and those who bicycle to work or services, provide striped Class II bike lanes within the right-of-way, with adequate delineation and signage, where feasible and appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.1.3</strong></td>
<td>Continue to acquire or reserve right-of-way and/or easements needed to complete the bicycle circulation system as development occurs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.1.4</strong></td>
<td>Where inadequate right-of-way exists for Class I or II bikeways, provide signage for Class III bike routes or designate alternative routes as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.1.5</strong></td>
<td>Plan for continuous bikeways to serve major destinations, including but not limited to regional shopping areas, college campuses, public buildings, parks, and employment centers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.2.1</strong></td>
<td>Require bicycle parking, which can include bicycle lockers and sheltered areas at commercial sites and multi-family housing complexes for use by employees and residents, as well as customers and visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.2.2</strong></td>
<td>Provide bicycle racks on transit vehicles to give bike-and-ride commuters the ability to transport their bicycles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 6.2.3</strong></td>
<td>Promote the inclusion of services for bicycle commuters, such as showers and changing rooms, as part of the development review process for new development or substantial alterations of existing commercial or industrial uses, where appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy C 7.1.1</strong></td>
<td>In reviewing new development proposals, consider pedestrian connections within and between developments as an integral component of the site design, which may include seating, shading, lighting, directional signage, accessibility, and convenience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy C 7.1.2  For existing walled subdivisions, extend pedestrian access to connect these neighborhoods to transit and services through public education and by facilitating retrofitted improvements where feasible.

Policy C 7.1.3  Where feasible and practical, consider grade separated facilities to provide pedestrian connections across arterial streets, flood control channels, utility easements, and other barriers.

Policy C 7.1.4  Identify and develop an improvement program to connect existing walkways and paseos to transit and services, where needed and appropriate.

Policy C 7.1.5  In new commercial development, provide for direct, clearly delineated, and preferably landscaped pedestrian walkways from transit stops and parking areas to building entries, and avoid placement of uses (such as drive-through facilities) in locations that would obstruct pedestrian pathways.

Policy C 7.1.6  Encourage placement of building entries in locations accessible to public sidewalks and transit.

Policy C 7.1.7  Utilize pedestrian-oriented scale and design features in areas intended for pedestrian use.

Policy C 7.1.8  Upgrade streets that are not pedestrian-friendly due to lack of sidewalk connections, safe street crossing points, vehicle sight distance, or other design deficiencies.

Policy C 7.1.9  Promote pedestrian-oriented street design through traffic calming measures where appropriate, which may include but are not limited to bulb-outs or chokers at intersections, raised crosswalks, refuge islands, striping, and landscaping.

Policy C 7.1.10  Continue to expand and improve the Valley’s multi-use trail system to provide additional routes for pedestrian travel.

Policy C 2.2.13 should be noted as it favors the rural character of some neighborhoods over pedestrian safety. The policy states: “Protect the community character of rural areas by requiring use of rural street standards, which may include reduced pavement width, reduced street lighting to protect night skies, rolled curbs or no curbs and no sidewalks.”

Bikeway Planning
The Circulation element presents cross-sections of roadways with bikeway and trail facilities, shown in Figure 3-1. On any street carrying over 10,000 vehicles per day at speeds of 30 mph or higher, striped bike lanes are recommended over bike routes. In selecting routes for bikeways that share the right-of-way with vehicles, design criteria include connectivity, traffic volumes, speeds, curb width, intersection protection, and the number of commercial driveways. In planning for bikeways, consideration should also be given to the differing needs of experienced cyclists versus casual riders, and to utilitarian cyclists versus recreational riders.
Figure 3-1
Circulation Element Roadway Cross-Sections with Bikeways

Major Highway with Bike Trail Detail

Major Highway with Bike Lane Detail

Major Highway 8-Lane Alternative with Bike Trail Detail

Major Highway 8-Lane Alternative with Bike Lane Detail
Pedestrian Planning
A fundamental goal of the General Plan is to create walkable communities and neighborhoods within the Santa Clarita Valley. In order to achieve this objective, pedestrian access must be considered in all phases of development planning, including site design, subdivision design, and public improvement projects. The basic needs for pedestrian travel are safety, connectivity, and accessibility for all, including the disabled.

3.1.1.2. Land Use Element
The Land Use Element of the General Plan addresses existing development patterns in the Santa Clarita Valley planning area and establishes a framework for focusing future growth in a logical and orderly manner. The map and policies of the Land Use Element were designed to encourage reduction of vehicle trips and use of other transportation modes, including public transit, bicycling, and walking. This goal is promoted through inclusion of mixed-use districts, which allow supportive services to be located in proximity to residential neighborhoods; inclusion of a master plan for trails into the Circulation Element; and designation of higher residential densities in areas served by public transit. In addition, limited commercial service centers will be allowed within residential neighborhoods, and will be accessible by walking, bicycling, and bus transit. Multiple-family residential uses will be allowed in regional and community commercial areas. More residences will be allowed within walking distance to rail transit stations to facilitate rail commuting to employment outside of the Santa Clarita Valley. Mixed residential densities will be allowed, to permit housing alternatives at all income levels and age preferences in proximity to transit, jobs, and services.

3.1.2. Municipal Code
Municipal Code Chapter 12 (Vehicles and Traffic) details standards for roads, sidewalks and bicycle facilities. The Municipal Code allows the Director to:

- Mark crosswalks if markings will improve traffic conditions.
- Restrict bicycle or pedestrian crossings if “traffic complications would exist if pedestrians or bicyclists were permitted to cross.”
- Sign and stripe bicycle lanes if roadway width and traffic can accommodate a separate bicycle lane. Motor vehicles are prohibited from driving in a bicycle lane.
- Place signs prohibiting pedestrians from using bicycle lanes if “sidewalks or other suitable area is available for pedestrian use.”

In 2009, City Council adopted an ordinance to add chapter 12.96 to the Municipal Code. Chapter 12.96 permits bicyclists to ride on sidewalks in Santa Clarita, except for on sidewalks in business districts and sidewalks located adjacent to an on-street bike lane. The City may also designate certain portions of the sidewalk as prohibited for bicycle use and will place appropriate signage and markings for clarification.

The Code also requires building owners or occupants to keep the sidewalk in front of their premises “in a clean and neat condition, free of offensive matter of any kind or nature.”
3.1.3. Unified Development Code

The City of Santa Clarita’s Unified Development Code (UDC) regulates all development within the City. Chapters 16 (Subdivisions) and 17 (Zoning) outline the allowable uses and standards for Santa Clarita. Chapter 17 contains several special standards districts, or overlay zones, which are applied to areas of the City with special characteristics or circumstances, such as Downtown Newhall or Sand Canyon. The UDC regulates the development of pedestrian facilities, such as sidewalks, includes a bicycle parking ordinance, and enables the City to exact trail dedications, and other such concessions which may be used in the development of non-motorized facilities. Table 3-3 summarizes the UDC’s non-motorized policies.

3.1.4. Mixed-Use Zones

The Santa Clarita Unified Development Code also identifies Mixed-Use Zones in Section 17.16.065. Mixed-Use Zones are used to encourage pedestrian-oriented development along improved transportation corridors. Mixed-Use Zones, as defined in the UDC, “encourage a mix of residential, commercial, employment and institutional opportunities within identified centers of activity along identified transportation corridors.” The mixed use (MU) zone provides a mechanism to revitalize older commercial corridors and properties, increases opportunities for infill development and encourages “pedestrian-oriented neighborhoods where local residents have services, shops, jobs and access to transit within walking distance of their homes.”

Table 3-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section Number</th>
<th>Policy Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.11.130 Pedestrian Ways</td>
<td>… a transverse pedestrian way of adequate width may be required through the approximate middle of each block having a length of more than seven hundred (700) feet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.17.050 Transit and Non-Motorized Access</td>
<td>Developments shall incorporate and be designed to encourage access by public transit and non-motorized modes of travel. This shall be accomplished by the incorporation of appropriate on-site bicycle and pedestrian amenities, and convenient connections to the City’s transit and non-motorized facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.21.070.E. Road Improvements</td>
<td>Developers shall install enhanced pedestrian crossing treatments adjacent to schools, parks, and facilities frequented by children, senior citizens, and/or disabled persons. At the discretion of the City, in lieu of providing said improvements, the developer shall pay a fee equal to the City’s cost of constructing the improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sidewalks--Required

16.21.170

…the subdivider shall install sidewalks not less than five (5) feet wide:

- A. On both sides of entrance and collector streets within the division of land;
- B. On both sides of loop, interior and cul-de-sac streets;
- C. Along one side of service roads adjacent to abutting lots;
- D. Along highways shown on the Master Plan of Arterial Highways where no service road is provided, and lots in the division of land take direct access to the highway; and
- E. Along highways shown on the Master Plan of Arterial Highways where necessary in order to provide for the safety and convenience of pedestrians.

### Sidewalks--Not Required

16.21.180

The construction of sidewalks is not required where:

- A. All lots in the division of land are 15,000 square feet or have an average width greater than 100 feet, except if sidewalks are required to maintain the continuity of an existing sidewalk network.
- B. The construction of sidewalks would be impractical because of topographical conditions or because of other physical obstacles;
- C. Sidewalks will not be in keeping with the neighborhood pattern;
- D. Sidewalks are not needed in, and will not benefit the area.

### On-Site Bicycle Parking Requirement

17.18.105

Every use shall provide on-site bicycle parking facilities to accommodate the required number of bicycle parking spaces. All bicycle parking shall be evenly dispersed throughout the project site to provide convenient bicycle parking. Parking is to be provided at the following ratios:

- Retail/Commercial Uses 1 space per each 25 vehicle parking stalls
- Office Uses 1 space per each 30 vehicle parking stalls
- Industrial Uses 1 space per each 40 vehicle parking stalls
- Multifamily Residential Uses 1 space per each 5 residential units

### MU- Mixed Use Zone

17.16.065

“These regulations encourage a mix of residential, commercial, employment and institutional opportunities within identified centers of activity along identified transportation corridors.” See section 3.1.5 in this document.

Mixed-Use Zones have a minimum residential density of 11-20 dwelling units per acre, providing the population needed to support pedestrian-oriented businesses and transit. The Mixed-Use Zone also includes Design Standards that encourage bicycle and pedestrian activity. Urban design standards require buildings to be designed with pedestrian needs in mind, including encouraging ground-floor retail uses along major pedestrian corridors.

Santa Clarita's Existing Mixed-Use Overlay Zones are located at the following locations:

- 1. Soledad Canyon Road from Bouquet Canyon Road to Solamint Canyon Road;
- 2. Sierra Highway from Newhall Avenue to Golden Valley Road;
- 3. Newhall Avenue from State Route 14 Freeway to Pine Street; and
- 4. Portions of Lyons Avenue from Newhall Avenue to Interstate 5.

---

1 Seven dwelling units per acre are typically the threshold above which transit use increases sharply. Pushkarev and Zupan, Public Transportation and Land Use Policy. 1977.
3.1.5. Downtown Newhall Specific Area Plan

In December 2005, the City of Santa Clarita adopted a Specific Plan for the historic community of Newhall, located within the City of Santa Clarita along the Lyons Avenue and Main Street/Newhall Avenue corridors. The Specific Plan provides guidelines for the redevelopment of the community, including design guidelines, implementation strategies and development requirements. The Downtown Newhall Specific Plan proposes to amend the area’s zoning to become subject to form-based rather than the existing use-based zoning. In 2008, the City made several amendments to the development code, none of which negatively impact bicycling and walking in Downtown Newhall.

In addition to the shift to form-based code, the Specific Plan redesignated San Fernando Road as a pedestrian-oriented Main Street, which the City has since implemented. A new library has been completed and a major streetscape project has been completed. The Specific Plan provides other recommendations for pedestrian-oriented development, including housing near a commuter rail station and a mix of uses to serve a vibrant urban village.

3.1.6. Community Character and Design Guidelines

The purpose of the Santa Clarita Community Character and Design Guidelines (CCDG) document is to guide the creation of new residential and non-residential developments and give clear direction for the renovation and redevelopment of built areas. The intent of the guidelines is to retain and encourage architectural variety, promote quality development, and address both existing and new development that:

- Is compatible in size, scale, and appearance with the character of Santa Clarita
- Is attractive and an asset to the community
- Preserves and enhances natural features on site
- Incorporates quality articulation, community character features, multiple building forms, desirable building details, and other elements that display excellence
- Provide pedestrian-oriented design to enrich the pedestrian experience

3.1.7. Other Specific Plans

A significant portion of the land in the City of Santa Clarita is part of a Specific Plan. According to the General Plan, the City of Santa Clarita has four approved Specific Plans: the North Valencia Specific Plan, the North Valencia II Specific Plan, the Vista Canyon Specific Plan, and the Porta Bella Specific Plan. Specific plans for the unincorporated areas surrounding the City of Santa Clarita are approved by the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

**North Valencia Specific Plan**

The North Valencia I Specific Plan area is located south of Newhall Ranch Road, west of Bouquet Canyon Road and Valencia Boulevard, and north of Magic Mountain Parkway. Approved in January 1998 by the City Council, it allows for a maximum of 2,000 residential units including 1,250 multi-family units. The Plan includes 636,000 square feet of commercial space, 167,000 square feet of industrial uses, and 355.6 acres of open space.
North Valencia II Specific Plan
The North Valencia II Specific Plan area encompasses approximately 596 acres. The planning area is located north of Newhall Ranch Road, south of Copper Hill Drive, east of the San Francisquito Creek, and west of McBean Parkway. Approved in January 2000, The North Valencia II Specific Plan allows for 1,900 dwelling units and up to a maximum of 150,000 square feet of commercial space.

Porta Bella Specific Plan (Whittaker-Bermite Property)
The Porta Bella Specific Plan provides a comprehensive land use plan for the 988-acre Whittaker-Bermite site in the center of the City, which was used for 80 years for the manufacturing of military explosives. This mixed-use project includes 1,244 single-family residential units and 1,677 multi-family residential units. It also includes 96 acres of commercial and office uses and over 400 acres of open space. Due to contamination, the development of this site includes environmental clean-up and state EPA certification prior to reuse.

Vista Canyon Specific Plan
On May 10, 2011 the City Council adopted the Vista Canyon Specific Plan subject to annexation to the City. This project, which is in the Canyon Country area, includes a significant employment center and town center for the eastern Santa Clarita Valley. Vista Canyon Ranch also proposes the development of 1,100 dwelling units and 950,000 square feet of commercial floor area, together with related infrastructure, including a new Multi-Modal Transportation Station (Metrolink Station and Bus Transfer Station) and water reclamation plant (which would provide recycled water for irrigation use on- and off-site). The project would add another 21 acres of parks/recreation facilities. The developers are proposing a new City park—the ten-acre Oak Park. Other recreational amenities include a Town Green, a Community Garden, the River Education/Community Center and project trails, including significant extensions of the Santa Clara River Trail. Up to six private recreational facilities would be constructed throughout the project.

3.1.8. Santa Clara River Recreation and Water Feature Study
The Santa Clara River Recreation and Water Feature Study was adopted by the City of Santa Clarita in 1991. This document is the City’s first step in planning for recreational use of the Santa Clara River within the City limits and is the document that spurred the development of the Santa Clara River Trail. The Plan envisions a river corridor that encompasses active and passive parks, natural areas, riverfront community centers and retail establishments, all linked by formal paseos and a multi-use trail system.

The Plan emphasizes the need for a multi-use trail system, stating that: “The success of the River Corridor Plan relies greatly on establishing a continuous trail system that connects recreational features along the river corridor, as well as local and regional destination points” (pg 10). In addition to recommending the creation of a multi-use trail system, the Plan recommends removing fences and barriers, as appropriate, along the river to provide public access to
the river and river trail. Additional transportation recommendations presented in the Plan include planning bicycle routes and pedestrian walkways from residential neighborhoods to the river, developing common signage plans for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists, and proactively planning for non-motorized connections between communities north of the Cross Valley Connector and the river to the south of the Cross Valley Connector. The Plan introduces the goal of working with jurisdictions along the Santa Clara River to develop a trail network that runs along the Santa Clara River from the San Gabriel Mountains to the Pacific Ocean.

Trail design guidelines are included in the Plan for three types of trails: hard surface trails, equestrian trails and soft surface hiking trails. The Plan also outlines guidelines for pedestrian bridges and access and connection points.

3.1.9. Transportation Development Plan

The Transportation Development Plan was adopted by the City of Santa Clarita in November 2006. The Plan summarizes the transit environment in Santa Clarita, including opportunities and constraints; provides recommendations for future route and service modifications; and establishes a financial plan through 2015. Transit ridership on City of Santa Clarita Transit tripled between 1996 and 2006, and due to projected increases in population growth, will continue to increase. The Plan makes several recommendations to improve pedestrian access to transit stops, including retrofitting sidewalks and paseos to provide connectivity to bus stops, providing directional signage on paseos, and improving pedestrian crossing opportunities across flood channels and arterials. Pedestrian-specific recommendations in the Transportation Development Plan have been incorporated into the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and are presented as recommendations in Section 6.3 Transit Recommendations. The City is currently updating its Transportation Development Plan, which is forecasted to be complete in 2013 and will establish a plan through 2023.

3.1.10. Lyons Corridor Plan

In order to make the City’s code consistent with the General Plan, the City of Santa Clarita is currently in the process of updating its planning and zoning regulations by developing a series of corridor plans. These plans will take on a form-based code type approach to address the relationship between the buildings themselves and public spaces for the entire community. In May of 2011, City staff began the planning and public outreach process for the Lyons Corridor Development Code, the first of the corridor plans. The Lyons Corridor Development code, further referred to as the Lyons Corridor Plan, spans Lyons Avenue between Interstate 5 and Newhall Avenue and was completed in 2013. This update provides an opportunity for the City to establish policies that create a more bicycle- and pedestrian-friendly environment. More information regarding the corridor plans can be found at: http://santaclaritacorridorplan.com/

3.1.11. California High Speed Rail

The California High-Speed Rail Authority has proposed high-speed train service for intercity travel in California between the major metropolitan centers of the San Francisco Bay Area and Sacramento in the north, through the Central Valley, to Los Angeles and San Diego in the south. The proposed alignment will travel through the City of Santa Clarita adjacent to existing Metrolink rail lines in the vicinity of Sand Canyon and eastern Canyon Country through the mountains and into Palmdale. There is no station planned for Santa Clarita, though the project will create impacts and changes to the City’s existing infrastructure and developments.
3. Planning and Policy Context

3.1.12. Annexations

The City has completed several annexations since the 2008 plan: Cooperstone, Elsmere Canyon, Soledad Commons, North Copper Hill, South Sand Canyon, Norland, Vista Canyon Ranch, and North Saugus. With these annexations, Santa Clarita is now third largest city in Los Angeles County.

3.1.13. Climate Action Plan

In August 2012, the City of Santa Clarita approved its Climate Action Plan (CAP). The purpose of the CAP is to measure the amount of greenhouse gas emissions generated within the City and to develop strategies to reduce the emissions in the future. The CAP includes a set of strategies the City can use to reduce the amount of greenhouse gas emissions produced in the community by the year 2020 in compliance with California Assembly Bill 32. The CAP is part of the General Plan process and as such will serve as a component of the General Plan document for the City to address Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions. A large portion of the GHG reductions would be achieved by the decrease in vehicle miles traveled in the City via changes in land use patterns and a greater emphasis of transit and alternative transportation programs.

3.2. Regional Plans

3.2.1. 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County

The 2009 Long Range Transportation Plan for Los Angeles County, adopted in October 2009 by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board, guides countywide transportation development through 2040. The three goals of the Plan are: 1) improving mobility of people and goods, 2) improving air quality by reducing mobile source emissions, and 3) increasing access to economic, educational, social, medical, cultural, recreational and governmental resources in Los Angeles County. The Plan relies on four key strategies to meet these goals: maintaining the existing transportation system, maximizing system efficiency, increasing system capacity, and managing demand.

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan for Santa Clarita includes demand management strategies that are supported by the County’s Long Range Transportation Plan. The transportation demand management strategies recommended by the Long Range Transportation Plan include rideshare programs, outreach to employers to encourage employee travel alternatives, programs that reward employees for trying an alternative to the drive alone commute, smart growth strategies to take advantage of transit, working with employers to promote telework opportunities, and using market strategies that generate revenue from auto use.

3.2.2. Los Angeles County Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan

The Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan was adopted in June 2006 by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority Board to promote bicycle use throughout the County. The Plan’s vision is to make bicycling an integral part of travel choice in the region and promote the linkage between bicycling and the countywide transit network. The Plan identifies 167 “bike-transit” hubs and provides resources for cities to evaluate and improve bicycle access at their transit hubs. The document identifies Santa Clarita’s three Metrolink Commuter Rail Stations and the McBean Regional Transit Center as bike-transit hubs within the City of Santa Clarita. The Plan also identifies gaps in the countywide bicycle trail network and recommends best-practice design measures for bicycle facilities. The goals of the County Plan are listed below in Table 3-4.
Central Goals of the Los Angeles County Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Summary of Guiding Principle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Planning &amp; Funding</td>
<td>Provide visionary leadership in planning and funding projects and programs that improve access and mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking</td>
<td>Encourage high quality end-of-trip facilities at commercial, employment, residential and transit locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike-to-Transit</td>
<td>Improve bicycle access to transit systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike to Work</td>
<td>Promote and increase employer bicycle incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Promotion</td>
<td>Provide leadership in building partnerships, funding, and resources for marketing bicycle use as a legitimate and healthy means of transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Education &amp; Safety</td>
<td>Increase and promote bicycle education and safety programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan identifies gaps in the County’s bicycle network and encourages cities to plan projects to fill these gaps. Two of the gaps are located in or adjacent to Santa Clarita, one in unincorporated Los Angeles County along the San Francisquito Creek between Santa Clarita and Castaic Lake, and the other along the Sierra Highway between The Old Road and the Soledad Canyon Bike Path. In addition to these gaps located within the City of Santa Clarita, the Plan identifies gaps located in unincorporated Los Angeles County. It should be noted that the Los Angeles County Plan focuses on gaps in the regional bikeway network, and is not a comprehensive list of all bikeway gaps in the County. Please see Table 3-5 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Castaic/San Francisquito</td>
<td>Santa Clarita/LA</td>
<td>Castaic Creek, San Franciscoquito</td>
<td>Connector between Santa Clarita &amp; Castaic Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creek</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Creek, Golden State Freeway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Santa Clarita/LA</td>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Connection between The Old Road &amp; Soledad Canyon Bike Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Old Road</td>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>The Old Road Adjacent to Golden</td>
<td>Connection between Valencia/Santa Clarita &amp; Railroad Avenue-Newhall Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Freeway</td>
<td>Metrolink ROW Bike Path in the San Fernando Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route 126</td>
<td>LA County</td>
<td>NW LA County Unincorporated</td>
<td>Connection between Santa Clarita and Ventura County Line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Los Angeles County Bicycle Strategic Transportation Plan, Table 1.
Note: All gaps listed above are designated as either Class II or Class III with possible constraints due to road widening.

3.2.3. Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan

The County of Los Angeles adopted its Bicycle Master Plan in March of 2012. The Plan proposes approximately 831 miles of new bikeways throughout unincorporated areas of the County and recommends various bicycle-friendly policies and programs to promote bicycle ridership amongst users of all ages and skill sets. As shown in Figure 3-2,
the Bicycle Master Plan proposes 16.5 miles of bicycle paths, 33.4 miles of bicycle lanes, and 108.5 miles of bicycle routes in the Santa Clarita Valley Planning Area, many of which are intersect the city's boundary.

Table 3-6 outlines which County-proposed facilities connect with bikeways shown in the 2006 Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Approximately 50 percent of County-proposed bikeways intersect with a bikeway proposed by the City of Santa Clarita.

Table 3-6  
Proposed County Bikeways Adjacent to Santa Clarita

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project ID</th>
<th>Proposed County Bikeways</th>
<th>Santa Clarita Connection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sierra Highway bike route</td>
<td>Sierra Highway existing bike lanes, proposed bike path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Old Road bike lanes</td>
<td>The Old Road existing bike route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>San Francisquito Creek Trail</td>
<td>Existing segment of San Francisquito Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway bike lanes</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway proposed bike path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jakes Way bike lanes</td>
<td>Sierra Highway proposed bike route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Plum Canyon Road bike lanes</td>
<td>Plum Canyon Road proposed bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Boquet Canyon Road bike route</td>
<td>Boquet Canyon Road existing bike lanes/path, Copper Hill Drive proposed bike lanes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road bike route</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road existing bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail existing segments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oak Springs Canyon Road bike path</td>
<td>Oak Springs Canyon Road proposed bike path/Soledad Canyon existing bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Via Princessa Road bike lanes</td>
<td>Sierra Highway existing bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Canyon Park Boulevard bike lanes</td>
<td>Sierra Highway proposed bike route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Henry Mayo Road bike lanes</td>
<td>Avenue Stanford existing bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Vasquez Canyon Road bike lanes</td>
<td>Vasquez Canyon Road proposed bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Sand Canyon Road bike route</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road existing bike lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Placerita Canyon Road bike route</td>
<td>Sierra Highway proposed bike route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.4. Los Angeles County Bicycle Transportation Account Compliance Document

The Bicycle Transportation Account Compliance Document is a companion to the Metro Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan. The purpose of the Document is to help local agencies establish funding eligibility for the State Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA) program. In 2006-2007, the BTA program awarded over $9 million to cities to help improve their bicycle facilities. The Document also includes an inventory of all existing and proposed bicycle facilities in the County, an estimate of ridership and future local needs. Santa Clarita’s Non-Motorized Transportation Plan includes the required elements to establish BTA funding eligibility.
3.2.5. Sustainable Communities Strategy

SB 375 sets out a path for establishing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction targets for the transportation sector (cars and light trucks) using an incentive based, regional approach. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) will set these reduction targets and Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) will develop plans to achieve them. The 14 sub-regions of the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG), the MPO representing six southern California counties, including Los Angeles County, will need to work together to create a regional plan, called a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS), as part of the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). The SCS will identify how regions will meet the emissions targets established by CARB. CARB will review the SCS and has approval authority.

3.3. Major Development Projects

3.3.1. Future Capital Improvement Projects

Santa Clarita’s Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) identifies and prioritizes capital improvement projects for fiscal years 2013-17. Capital improvement projects add to or improve the City’s infrastructure and may include projects such as bridge widening, trail and bike lane construction, installation of sidewalks, intersection improvements and development of public facilities such as the Sports Complex Center or Metrolink stations. The current CIP identifies $47 million in improvements and projects, of which approximately $34 million is dedicated to projects that include a non-motorized component.

Table 3-7 describes each project with a non-motorized component, as well as the estimated cost of implementation. Bikeway projects were taken from the 2006 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tournament Road Streetscape</td>
<td>Improvements may include a decomposed granite walkway</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseo Bridge Replacement Program</td>
<td>Replace seven timber bridges with steel truss frames to address structural distress</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Repair Program</td>
<td>Repairs to City sidewalks damaged by tree roots and pavement settlement</td>
<td>$344,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseo Bridge Replacement Program (Valencia)</td>
<td>Replace Carrizo wood bridge with steel truss; replace Del Monte and El Paseo pedestrian bridges</td>
<td>$2,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Repair Program</td>
<td>Repairs to City sidewalks damaged by tree roots and pavement settlement</td>
<td>$1,540,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan Heidt and Via Princessa Metrolink Repairs</td>
<td>Replace worn out truncated dome tiles at Jan Heidt station; replace worn out truncated dome tiles on wheelchair ramps at Via Princessa station</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Area Signage Removal and Replacement</td>
<td>Remove and replace school area signage, refurbish pavement markings, and modify existing crosswalks at 12 elementary schools</td>
<td>$150,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Crest Park</td>
<td>Project includes pathway updates</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Road/SR-14 Bridge Widening</td>
<td>Project includes construction of a sidewalk on the north side of the bridge, and a shared sidewalk and bike path on the south side</td>
<td>$9,273,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon Road Bridge Widening</td>
<td>Project includes a multi-use path on the northern side of the bridge</td>
<td>$1,201,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Parkway Widening Over the River</td>
<td>Project includes construction of a Class I bike path connecting McBean Parkway and the Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>$9,403,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon Road Bridge Widening</td>
<td>Project includes a multi-use path on the northern side of the bridge</td>
<td>$1,201,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Parkway Widening Over the River</td>
<td>Project includes construction of a Class I bike path connecting McBean Parkway and the Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>$9,403,917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road Bridge Widening Over San Francisquito Creek – Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Project would include a multi-use path</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access Ramp Construction Program</td>
<td>Project will construct access ramps in high-demand areas of the City, including near schools</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II and III Bikeway Construction</td>
<td>Restriping Tourney Road from Valencia Boulevard to Magic Mountain Parkway, Orchard Village Road from McBean Parkway to Lyons Avenue, Centre Point Parkway from Golden Valley Road to Golden Triangle Road, and Golden Triangle Road from Centre Point Parkway to Rainbow Glen Drive</td>
<td>$272,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Transit Center Regional Park-and-Ride</td>
<td>Project includes bicycle lockers</td>
<td>$5,641,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Avenue Pedestrian Facilities and Sidewalk PH II</td>
<td>Construction of a signalized pedestrian crossing over the SCRAA tracks at Railroad Avenue and Newhall Avenue to Third Street</td>
<td>$1,548,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Routes to School VII</td>
<td>Construction of pedestrian improvements near Sky Blue Mesa, Pinetree, and James Foster Elementary Schools; may include widening sidewalks, paving, striping, signage, and construction of roadway bulb-outs</td>
<td>$587,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Transit Bus Stop Amenities</td>
<td>Street furniture, such as bus benches, bus shelter, trash receptacles, and lighting infrastructure improvements to improve accessibility for disabled residents</td>
<td>$161,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road/Golden Valley Road Bike Path - North</td>
<td>510 foot bike path north of Soledad Canyon Road to Valley Center Drive, connecting from the Golden Valley Road Class I bike path to the Soledad existing trail</td>
<td>$91,162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL COST** $33,761,635
Figure 3-2
Proposed County Bikeways Adjacent to Santa Clarita
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4. **NEEDS OF THE NON-MOTORIZED SYSTEM**

This chapter presents an overview of the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in the City of Santa Clarita. The intention of this chapter is to provide a framework for understanding the needs of Santa Clarita’s bicyclists and pedestrians.

4.1. **Needs and Types of Bicyclists**

It is important to understand that the needs and preferences of bicyclists vary depending on the skill level of the cyclist and the type of trip the cyclist is taking. For example, bicyclists who bicycle for recreational purposes may prefer scenic, winding, off-street trails, while bicyclists who bicycle to work or for errands may prefer more direct on-street bicycle facilities. A bicycle plan should consider these differences when planning a system that serves all user types. The following sections describe the different types of bicyclists, the different reasons for bicycling, and the respective needs of these categories of bicyclists.

4.1.1. **Needs of Casual and Experienced Bicyclists**

For the purposes of this Plan, bicyclists are separated into two skill levels: casual and experienced. Casual bicyclists include youth and adults who are intermittent riders. Some casual bicyclists, such as youth under driving age, may be unfamiliar with operating a vehicle on roads and related laws. Experienced bicyclists include commuters, long-distance road bicyclists, racers, and those who use their bicycle as a primary means of transportation. A summary of the needs of the different types of bicyclists is provided below in Table 4-1.
Table 4-1
Characteristics of Casual and Experienced Bicyclists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Casual Riders</th>
<th>Experienced Riders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer off-street bike paths or bike lanes along low-volume, low-speed streets</td>
<td>Prefer on-street or bicycle-only facilities to multi-use paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May have difficulty gauging traffic and may be unfamiliar with rules of the road. May walk bike across intersections.</td>
<td>Comfortable riding with vehicles on streets. Negotiates streets like a motor vehicle, including “taking the lane” and using left-turn pockets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May use less direct route to avoid arterials with heavy traffic volumes.</td>
<td>May prefer a more direct route.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May ride on sidewalks and ride the wrong way on streets and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Avoids riding on sidewalks or on multi-use paths. Rides with the flow of traffic on streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May ride at speeds comparable to walking, or slightly faster than walking.</td>
<td>Rides at speeds up to 20 mph on flat ground, up to 40 mph on steep descents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycles shorter distances: up to 2 miles</td>
<td>May cycle longer distances, sometimes more than 100 miles.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The casual bicyclist will benefit from route markers, multi-use paths, bike lanes on lower-volume streets, traffic calming, and educational programs. Casual bicyclists may also benefit from a connected network of marked routes that lead to parks, schools, shopping areas, and other destinations. To encourage youth to ride, routes must be safe enough for their parents to allow them to ride.

The experienced bicyclist will benefit from a connected network of bike lanes on higher-volume arterials, wider curb lanes and loop detectors at signals. The experienced bicyclist who is primarily interested in exercise will benefit from loop routes that lead back to the point of origin.

Because of its extensive network of trails and bike paths, Santa Clarita offers many good opportunities for casual bicyclists. Many of these trails and paths are accessible from residential roads. Many experienced bicyclists, including those who bicycle long distances for exercise or training, also use the multi-use paths within the City. It is common for these bicyclists to make a 30-mile loop around the City, primarily on the trail system. This combination of fast-moving bicyclists on training rides with slower-moving casual bicyclists and pedestrians may result in user conflicts. Santa Clarita is moving in the direction of providing more on-street facilities to provide a variety of training and commuting opportunities for cyclists.

4.1.2. Characteristics of Recreational and Utilitarian Trips

For the purpose of this Plan, bicycle trips are separated into two trip types: recreational and utilitarian. Recreational trips can range from a 50-mile weekend group rides along Sierra Highway to a family outing along the Santa Clara River Trail, and all levels in between. Utilitarian trips include commuter bicyclists, which are a primary focus of state and federal bicycle funding, as well as bicyclists going to school, shopping or running other errands. Please see Table 4-2 on the following page.
### Table 4-2

**Characteristics of Recreational and Utilitarian Trips**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recreational Trips</th>
<th>Utilitarian Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directness of route not as important as visual interest, shade, protection from wind</td>
<td>Directness of route and connected, continuous facilities more important than visual interest, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loop trips may be preferred to backtracking</td>
<td>Trips generally travel from residential to shopping or work areas and back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips may range from under a mile to over 50 miles</td>
<td>Trips generally are 1-5 miles in length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term bicycle parking should be provided at recreational sites, parks, trailheads and other recreational activity centers</td>
<td>Short-term and long-term bicycle parking should be provided at stores, transit stations, schools, workplaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varied topography may be desired, depending on the skill level of the cyclist</td>
<td>Flat topography is desired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May be riding in a group</td>
<td>Often ride alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May drive with their bicycles to the starting point of a ride</td>
<td>Use bicycle as primary transportation mode for the trip; may transfer to public transportation; may or may not have access to a car for the trip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trips typically occur on the weekend or on weekdays before morning commute hours or after evening commute hours</td>
<td>Trips typically occur during morning and evening commute hours (commute to school and work). Shopping trips also occur on weekends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of facility varies, depending on the skill level of cyclist</td>
<td>Generally use on-street facilities, may use pathways if they provide easier access to destinations than on-street facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recreational bicyclists’ needs vary depending on their skill level. Road bicyclists out for a 100-mile weekend ride may prefer well-maintained roads with wide shoulders and few intersections, and few stop signs or stop lights. Casual bicyclists out for a family trip may refer a quiet bike path with adjacent parks, benches, and water fountains.

Utilitarian bicyclists have needs that are more straightforward. Key commuter needs are summarized below.

- Commuter routes should be direct, continuous, and connected.
- Protected intersection crossing locations are needed for safe and efficient bicycle commuting.
- Bicycle commuters must have secure places to store their bicycles at their destinations.
- Bicycle facilities should be provided on arterials.

As mentioned in the previous section, Santa Clarita’s trail system provides excellent opportunities for the casual recreational rider. The trail system also provides access to shopping and employment opportunities within Valencia, Newhall, Saugus, and along Soledad Canyon Road into Canyon Country—all of which are important to the utilitarian rider. However, not all communities have easy bicycle access to the trail system. For the casual recreational rider, this may not be a serious deterrent, since they be willing and able to drive their bicycle to the trailhead. However, this may not be an option for the experienced recreational rider or the commuter, as they generally would like to use their bicycle for the whole trip. Bicycle-friendly connections between the residential areas and the trails will likely increase in the prevalence of bicycle commuting, as well as increase the prevalence of recreational riding.
4.2. Needs of Pedestrians

People walk for many reasons: traveling to work, transit or other multi-modal facilities, school, recreation and entertainment, health and exercise, shopping, social events, personal errands, appointments, and social visits. Pedestrian needs for different trip types vary. For example, a commuter may desire a well-connected direct route with efficient signal timing, while a recreational pedestrian may be more concerned about the aesthetics of the surroundings. However, all pedestrians have several needs in common, such as safety, connectivity, and accessibility. Pedestrian mobility networks should also consider persons with disabilities. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) mandates that reasonable accommodation for access should be provided for those who may need such assistance.

Based on field observations and input provided in the public input process, the most critical needs of pedestrians in Santa Clarita include:

- **Crossing visibility.** Crossing facilities, including crosswalks and signage, should alert both motorists and pedestrians to the presence of the facility. Crosswalk design can aid in increasing visibility through the use of specific striping patterns and lights.

- **Continuous facilities.** Sidewalk gaps, missing sidewalks and worn crosswalks are all barriers to safe pedestrian travel. Continuous facilities allow pedestrians to choose the safest and most efficient path to and from their destination, encouraging them to choose walking as their mode of transportation.

- **Common design guidelines.** Narrow sidewalks, sidewalks that are directly adjacent to heavy-volume roadways without vegetation or parking buffer, and sidewalks with utility boxes or lighting poles in the walkway detract from the walking environment and can make it difficult or impossible for the mobility-impaired to use the sidewalk. A retrofitting program to bring existing sidewalks up to code can improve the walking environment.

- **Slow traffic speeds.** The larger the roadway or turning radii at intersections, the faster vehicles will proceed through the area. Where appropriate, constraining roadway width with bulbouts and tightening right turns at intersections can slow vehicles as they approach areas with high pedestrian volumes.

- **Mixed land uses.** Segregated land uses generally increase the distance between different destinations, and make it difficult for residents to walk to employment, shopping, schools and recreational facilities from their homes. Mixed land uses make it easier to build housing, employment, shopping, schools, and recreational amenities within walking distance of each other.

- **Direct connections.** Pedestrians must sometimes walk long distances to access adjacent destinations when the street network is developed in a non-grid street pattern with cul-de-sacs and limited collector streets that connect to the arterial network. Pedestrian cut-throughs between cul-de-sacs and paseo networks that create direct connections reduce walking distances. The Valencia neighborhood of Santa Clarita already have well-developed paseo networks, which should be used as a model for future developments.
4.3. Non-Motorized Activity Centers

There are several major destinations within Santa Clarita that are expected to have high bicycle and pedestrian use. They are described below and shown in Figure 2-2, Existing Bicycle Facilities, Trails and Destinations in Chapter 2.

**Valencia Town Center**
The Valencia Town Center is a pedestrian-friendly shopping and entertainment area with 292 stores and a movie theater. The Center is located approximately two miles east of Magic Mountain on Valencia Boulevard near City Hall, County offices, the police station and library. It is accessible by six public transit routes. The Valencia Town Center provides pedestrian access through sidewalks and overpasses, and has a wide variety of pedestrian amenities within the shopping area. The Center has high-quality bicycle racks, but lacks bikeways through the parking lot to access the shops. The Center sponsors the free Westfield Walkers Group, an exercise club with monthly health seminars, and hosts a summer concert series on Friday evenings.

**City and County Offices**
Many of the City’s governmental buildings are located on Valencia Boulevard between McBean Parkway and Magic Mountain Parkway and are within walking distance of several destinations, including Valencia Town Center and other retail establishments.

**Downtown Newhall**
Downtown Newhall is a historic district located along the Lyons Avenue and Main Street/Newhall Avenue corridors. The area was established as a redevelopment area in 1997 to encourage economic revitalization, though as of 2012 redevelopment areas no longer exist with the abolishment of Community Redevelopment Agencies. In December 2005, the City adopted the Downtown Newhall Specific Plan, with the purpose of developing a pedestrian-friendly commercial and cultural district. The Downtown Newhall area is served by the Jan Heidt Newhall Metrolink station. Since adoption of the specific plan, Downtown Newhall has undergone several redevelopment projects, including construction of the new library at the intersection of Main Street and Lyons Avenue. The Downtown Newhall Specific Plan is described in more detail in Chapter 3.

**Metrolink Stations and Transit Transfer Centers**
The City has three Metrolink stations – Santa Clarita, located on Soledad Canyon Road near Bouquet Canyon Road, Jan Heidt Newhall, on Market Street and Railroad Avenue, and Via Princessa, located on Via Princessa between Sierra Highway and Whites Canyon Road. Each Metrolink station provides secure bicycle lockers. The McBean Regional Transit Center, located at the corner of McBean Parkway and Valencia Boulevard, provides bicycle racks, lockers and restrooms. The City is in the process of expanding the transit center to add six new bus bays, passenger loading areas, and a new park and ride lot with approximately 300 spaces. All new bus routes will go through this transfer station. With the development of the Vista Canyon specific Plan, the Via Princessa Station will eventually be relocated east of Sierra Highway to become part of a multi-modal transportation station. More details on the Vista Canyon Specific Plan are provided in Chapter 3.
Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital

The Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital is a 217-bed not-for-profit community hospital and trauma center, which opened in 1975. The Hospital is located at 23845 McBean Parkway in Valencia. The Hospital is also one of Santa Clarita’s largest employers, with 860 employees.

Colleges

Santa Clarita is home to four colleges. College of the Canyons is a community college serving approximately 15,000 students. The 153-acre campus is located east of I-5 off Valencia Boulevard. The Canyon Country Campus of College of the Canyons is located on Sierra Highway north of Soledad Canyon Road. The administrative offices are located at 26455 Rockwell Canyon Road. The Valencia campus is linked to the surrounding areas through the City’s network of paseos. The California Institute of the Arts is a private institution, which offers undergraduate and graduate degrees in visual and performing arts. The campus is located at 24700 McBean Parkway to the east of I-5. The Institute enrolls approximately 1,400 students per year. The Masters College is a private liberal arts college located near the intersection of Placerita Canyon Road and Newhall Avenue. The Masters College enrolls approximately 1,000 students. Finally, the California Design College (CDC) has a campus in Canyon Country.

Magic Mountain

The Six Flags/Magic Mountain amusement park is Santa Clarita’s second-largest employer and a major draw of visitors. It is located west of Interstate 5 in Los Angeles County. It is the City’s policy to locate supporting services, including hotels and shopping areas within close proximity to the Magic Mountain Park.

The Industrial Center

The 1,117-acre Valencia Industrial Center is home to over 700 businesses and approximately 17,400 employees. Several of Santa Clarita's largest employers are located in the Valencia Industrial Center. This area is currently served by two of Santa Clarita Transit's busiest lines, though the Valencia Industrial Center. Overall, the area lacks sidewalks and pedestrian amenities. The City has recently installed bike lanes that run through sections of the Industrial Center. The Center is also located adjacent to several of the City's existing bike paths, with a few access points connecting businesses to the bicycle network. There is opportunity to expand on-street and off-street bikeways in this location.

Bicycle Commute Routes

Many people travel through Santa Clarita from Castaic and neighborhoods in the north of the City to access the Metrolink Stations or continue on to employment in the San Fernando Valley or Ventura County. Key bicycle commuter routes include The Old Road (County jurisdiction), Bouquet Canyon Road and Sand Canyon Road. Enhancing regional commuting routes will require collaboration between the City, Los Angeles County and Caltrans.

Parks and Regional Open Space

Santa Clarita’s 26 City parks are key activity centers. Many are linked by Santa Clarita’s extensive trails system. The City parks provide areas for child play, picnics, barbecues and organized sports such as basketball, baseball, soccer and tennis. Regional destinations include Castaic Lake Recreation Area, Towsley Canyon Park, Michael D. Antonovich

1 http://www.canyons.edu/offices/instdev/ProfileSheets/Fall2011FactSheet.pdf
2 http://calarts.edu/admissions/FAQ
Open Space, Placerita Canyon Open Space, Whitney Canyon Park and the Los Angeles National Forest. Many of the regional parks permit mountain biking on trails.

4.4. Public Outreach and Surveys

Public involvement is important to the success of any non-motorized transportation plan. An extensive outreach program was created to solicit input for Santa Clarita’s 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, including an on-line survey, bi-lingual questionnaires, two community meetings, a project-specific website, and press releases and email announcements. Outreach for the 2012 Plan Update was conducted through focus groups for site-specific improvements.

This section first summarizes the findings from the focus groups held for the 2012 update. Then, it summarizes the results of the on-line survey held during the development of the first Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.

4.4.1. Focus Group Findings

As part of the public outreach process for the 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the City held two focus groups. The first focus group was with the Old Town Newhall Association, a group of business owners in Newhall, to ask for input regarding bicycle and pedestrian improvements in Downtown Newhall. The meeting was conducted as part of the association’s regular meeting on September 19, 2012 at 9:00 am and including approximately 20 participants. Feedback received from the group includes:

- Install bike racks (support for artistic racks) in on-street no parking zones rather than on the sidewalks to give more flexibility for business owners to use the sidewalks for other purposes
- Install signage and increase education efforts to address bicyclists riding on the sidewalks
- Enforce bicyclists riding on the sidewalks
- A bike path from Master’s College to Downtown Newhall is a priority to increase business

The second focus group was with the Valley Industry Association, a group representing business owners in the Valencia Industrial Center. The meeting was conducted as part of the association’s regularly scheduled meeting on September 27, 2012 at 7:30 am and including approximately 15 participants. Feedback received from the group includes:

- Install sidewalks throughout the Valencia Industrial Center
- Employers would like pathways for their employees to walk on to get to work
- There is a lack of on-street parking so people have to walk long distances in the street to reach their destinations: Convert parallel parking to angled parking on wide streets
4.4.2. On-Line Survey

During the development of the 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, community members were invited to respond to an online survey about walking and biking. Response was high; 352 survey responses were received. A summary of responses is provided below, and response charts are provided in Figures 4-2 through 4-5 on the next two pages. All results are from 2006.

**Figure 4-2: Why and Where Do You Bike?**

Total responses: 352.

**Figure 4-3: Why and Where Do You Walk?**

Total responses: 352.
4. Needs Analysis

**Figure 4-4: What Prevents You From Biking More Often?**

Total responses: 352.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responding (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too many cars/cars drive too fast</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No bike paths, lanes or bike routes</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike paths are in poor condition</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places are too far away</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough lighting</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to carry things</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I travel with small children</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't own a bicycle</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't have enough time</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents could select more than one answer. Percentages reflect the number of respondents who selected an answer.

**Figure 4-5: What Prevents You From Walking More Often?**

Total responses: 352.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Responding (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too many cars/cars drive too fast</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers don’t stop for pedestrians</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too hard to cross the street</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sidewalk/curb ramps</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places are too far away</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough lighting</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to carry things</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I travel with small children</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have enough time</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents could select more than one answer. Percentages reflect the number of respondents who selected an answer.
The majority of respondents bike and walk for pleasure or for exercise (Biking: 68% for pleasure, 72% for exercise; Walking 75% for pleasure, 82% for exercise). Nineteen percent of respondents did not bicycle, 14% used their bicycle to get to work or for errands and shopping. Only five percent of respondents walked to work, but a significant percentage (27%) walked to run errands or go shopping. These results suggest that recreational biking and walking is high in Santa Clarita, and that many residents are already walking to run errands.

When asked what prevents them from biking more often, 54% cited “too many cars/cars drive too fast” and 50% cited “no bike paths, lanes, or routes.” This suggests that building new bicycle facilities and improving bicycle connections between residential areas and the existing network of bicycle paths and lanes may increase the number of trips that are taken by bicycle, and may increase the number of bicyclists in Santa Clarita.

When asked what prevents them from walking more often, respondents chose a variety of reasons. The top three reasons are “not enough time,” “too many cars/cars drive too fast,” “places too far away,” and “drivers don’t stop for pedestrians.” These results suggest that residents can be encouraged to walk more by reducing distances between residential and shopping, employment and entertainment areas. In the short-term, this can be accomplished by creating paseo-style connections within and between neighborhoods and in the long term by encouraging mixed-use development. Residential traffic calming programs and citywide education measures may help improve the walking environment by increasing driver yielding behavior.

Residents cited traffic speeds and volumes as a common deterrent for bicycling and walking. Facilities that reduce the effect of traffic on bicyclists and pedestrians can alleviate some of this concern. These may include providing buffers between roadways and paths, grade-separated crossings, and on-street facilities that provide bicyclists with their own space, such as bicycle lanes. These concerns can also be addressed by programs that reduce traffic speeds in residential neighborhoods; intersection controls, signage and striping that enhance pedestrian and bicyclist safety and visibility; and citywide educational programs.

4.4.3. Intercept Surveys

As part of the 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the Los Angeles Bicycle Coalition conducted intercept surveys at the intersection of McBean Parkway and Newhall Ranch Road and at the three Metrolink Stations. Respondents were asked questions similar to the on-line survey. In general, the survey responses were similar to those of the on-line survey. A total of 31 people responded. The typical respondent was a male long-distance cyclist who rode over 150 miles per week who rode for exercise. Respondents were asked to rank their preference for bike paths, bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, and dirt trails. On average, respondents rated bike paths highest, followed by bike lanes, bicycle boulevards and dirt trails. Many of the respondents wanted to have easier access from their home to bicycle paths, shopping centers, or parks. Many of the respondents cited traffic speeds and volumes as deterrents to bicycling more frequently.

4.5. Collision Analysis

Safety is a major concern for pedestrians and bicyclists. For those who currently ride a bicycle or walk, safety is typically an on-going concern. For those who do not, it is one of the most compelling reasons not to walk or bicycle.
Nationwide, the total number of reported cyclist fatalities has dropped dramatically since 1994, with 802 fatalities reported in 1994 and 618 fatalities reported in 2010, an approximately 23% reduction. The same study shows that in 2010, of all California traffic fatalities 3.6% were cyclist fatalities (99 fatalities). This is higher than the nationwide average of 1.9%, but does not take into account the higher rates of cycling found in California. Bicyclist fatalities in California represent a fatality rate of one per 2.65 per million people.

According to a 1990 study of 3,000 bicycle crashes, the most common type of bicycle-vehicle crash was one where the motorist failed to yield right-of-way at a junction (21.7% of all crashes). More than a third of these involved a motorist violating the sign or signal and driving into the crosswalk or intersection and striking the bicyclist. The next most common types of vehicle-bicycle crash were where the bicyclist failed to yield right-of-way at an intersection (16.8%), a motorist turning or merging into the path of a cyclist (12.1%) and a bicyclist failing to yield right-of-way at a midblock location.

These data suggest that a bicycle safety plan should address intersection improvements and education about the rights and responsibilities of cyclists and motorists, especially regarding right-of-way laws. Intersection improvements are especially important where driveways and roadways cross parallel bicycle paths. Specific design recommendations for pathway intersections are discussed in Chapter 6, Section 6.1 Design Recommendations.

Data for reported pedestrian and bicycle collisions in Santa Clarita were collected from the Transportation Injury Mapping System (TIMS) for the years 2006-2010, and are presented in Table 4-3 and Table 4-4. In this period, there were 127 total bicycle collisions. The number of bicycle collisions varied from year to year, as well as the percentage of total collisions involving bicyclists. Santa Clarita had no fatal bicycle crashes in this time period as compared to an average of 0.6 bicyclist fatalities per year from 2002-2005. The average bicyclist fatality rate expected for a city of comparable size is 0.5 per year. Santa Clarita experienced 177 pedestrian collisions in this time period, six of which resulted in fatalities. Half of the fatal pedestrian collisions occurred in 2010, while total pedestrian collision collisions dropped. Overall, pedestrian collisions have decreased between 2006 and 2010.

### Table 4-3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Complaint of Pain</th>
<th>Other Visible Injury</th>
<th>Severe Injury</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Total Bike Collisions</th>
<th>Total Collisions</th>
<th>% of Collisions involving cyclists</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 TIMS data does not include non-injury collisions. Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS) was not available.
Table 4-4
Collisions Involving Pedestrians in Santa Clarita, 2006-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Complaint of Pain</th>
<th>Other Visible Injury</th>
<th>Severe Injury</th>
<th>Fatal</th>
<th>Total Ped Collisions</th>
<th>Total Collisions</th>
<th>% of Collisions involving pedestrians</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6. System Usage

4.6.1. Census 2010 Bicycle and Pedestrian Commute Counts

A primary data source for estimating biking and walking rates is the U.S. Census. Journey to work data was obtained from the American Community Survey for Santa Clarita, Los Angeles County, California, and the United States. Journey to work data are shown in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5
Journey to Work Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
<th>Santa Clarita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drove Alone</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpool</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transit</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Data 2006-2011

As shown, approximately 0.4% of Santa Clarita journey-to-work trips are made by bicycle and 1.5% of trips are made by foot, as compared to 0.4% of trips made by bicycle and 1.3% of trips made by foot in 2000. As shown, bicycling mode share has remained constant while walking has increased. It is certain that more people bicycle and walk in Santa Clarita than Census data suggests. The Biking and Walking Survey discussed earlier in this chapter shows that people are five times more likely to bike for pleasure than bike to work and 16 times more likely to walk for pleasure than walk to work. Census data does not include the number of people who walk or bicycle for recreation or for utilitarian purposes, students traveling to school, or commuters who travel from outside Santa Clarita. Census data is also limited in that it reflects only a person’s dominant commute mode and does not count non-motorized trips that are part of another trip, for example, a person who walks or bicycles to a transit station.
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4.6.2. City of Santa Clarita Bicycle and Pedestrian Counts

The City conducted limited bicycle and pedestrian counts at three locations in summer 2006. Counts were taken at Camp Plenty Trailhead, at the intersection of McBean Parkway and Magic Mountain Parkway and along the South Fork Trail. The one count at McBean Parkway and Magic Mountain Parkway was taken during afternoon commute hours (4:00 to 5:00 pm) and shows 10 bicyclists, five pedestrians and five people using other non-motorized means (e.g. skateboards). Counts were taken at Camp Plenty Trailhead and at the South Fork Trail during morning commute hours (approximately 7:30 to 8:30 am), midday mid-week (12:15 pm to 1:15 pm) and on the weekend morning (9:00 to 10:00 am).

Weekend hourly trail use was higher than weekday hourly trail use for both count locations. Eighteen bicyclists and 15 pedestrians were counted at Camp Plenty during the weekday morning, while 48 bicyclists and 12 pedestrians were counted during the weekend morning. At South Fork Trail, 23 bicyclists and five pedestrians were counted during the weekday morning, while trail use increased to 84 bicyclists and 36 pedestrians during the weekend morning. It is clear from these numbers that people are actively using Santa Clarita’s trail system, with especially high use on the weekends.

It should be noted that these counts are limited, and may not reflect actual bicycle and pedestrian use. Weekend use, in particular, may be higher than these numbers indicate, as weekend use typically peaks between noon and 2:00 pm.
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5. **Recommended Improvements**

This chapter presents recommended bicycle and pedestrian facilities and programs for the City of Santa Clarita, including improvements identified in the 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan that have not yet been completed and new recommendations for several targeted geographic regions in the city. Geographic regions included are:

- Downtown Newhall
- Santa Clarita Metrolink Station
- Valencia Industrial Center
- McBean Regional Transit Center
- Town Center

The chapter is divided into the following sections:

5.1 **Recommended Bicycle Network** presents proposed bikeways, including those that have not been completed from the 2008 plan. (Page 5-1)

5.2 **Recommended Pedestrian Network** describes the recommended improvements to make Santa Clarita more pedestrian-friendly. (Page 5-5)

5.3 **Targeted Geographic Improvements** provides recommended design concepts for the areas identified above. (Page 5-6)

5.4 **Design and Programmatic Recommendations** presents design guidelines for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and educational and encouragement programs to promote biking and walking in Santa Clarita. (Page 5-16)

5.5 **Project Sheets** presents projects from the 2008 plan that have not been completed. (Page 5-29)

5.1. **Recommended Bicycle Network**

The bicycle network is intended to define routes that provide a superior level of service for bicyclists. The network serves as a tool that allows the City to focus and prioritize facility implementation efforts to provide the greatest benefit to bicyclists and the community at large.

The recommended bicycle network has been developed to build upon the network proposed in the 2008 plan, to fill in gaps within the current network, to continue the expansion of the existing trail network, to formalize existing routes used by cyclists, and to improve access between residential neighborhoods and the current bikeway network. Please see **Figure 5-1**. The projects reflect the City’s existing and future roadway and trail plans.
Figure 5-1: Recommended Bicycle Network
The City of Santa Clarita has implemented many projects since adopting the 2008 plan (see Chapter 2). Recommended bikeways in this plan include projects from the 2008 plan that the City has not yet completed, as well as three additional bikeways:

- Bike lanes on Avenue Tibbitts (Newhall Ranch Road to Santa Clara River Trail)
- Bike boulevard on Walnut Street-Main Street (South Fork Trail to 6th Street)
- Bikeway connection through the Valencia Town Center (Class II or Class III)

Bikeways are presented in Table 5-1 and include bikeways from the previous plan that have not yet been constructed. Of the projects identified in the 2008 plan that have not yet been completed, most of them are long Class I bike paths. These projects have been segmented into smaller sections that will be easier to fund and construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bike Paths</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail – South</td>
<td>Espuella Drive</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail – Center</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>Haskell Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail – North</td>
<td>Haskell Canyon Road</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Road</td>
<td>Existing Path (South of Valley Center Drive)</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Road</td>
<td>Green Mountain Road</td>
<td>CA-14</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway (Planned Extension)</td>
<td>South Fork Trail (west side)</td>
<td>Via Princessa (Planned extension)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Road Bridge Upgrade</td>
<td>Santa Clarita River Trail</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Creek</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road</td>
<td>Avenue Tibbitts</td>
<td>San Francisquito Creek (east side)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Extension (Planned)</td>
<td>Plum Canyon Road</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Road</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>Market Street</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita River Trail (west)</td>
<td>Existing Path</td>
<td>Golden Valley Road</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita River Trail (west-center)</td>
<td>Golden Valley Road</td>
<td>Canyon View Drive/Existing Path</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita River Trail (center)</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>Bentgrass Way</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita River Trail</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>Sand Canyon Road</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Listed as Class II
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Mileage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (northeast)</td>
<td>Lost Canyon Road Trailhead</td>
<td>City Limits (Oak Spring Canyon Road)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail (east side) – connection to existing path</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway (Planned Extension)</td>
<td>Via Princessa (Planned Extension)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail Extension</td>
<td>Orchard Village Road</td>
<td>Lyons Avenue</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Town Center North-South Connector</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway</td>
<td>Valencia Boulevard</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Princessa (Planned Extension) (west)</td>
<td>Claiborne Road</td>
<td>Golden Valley Road</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Princessa (Planned Extension) (east)</td>
<td>Golden Valley Road</td>
<td>Sheldon Avenue</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Creek Bike Path</td>
<td>Newhall Avenue</td>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mileage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>26.5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class II Bike Lanes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Tibbitts</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road</td>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Drive</td>
<td>McBean Parkway</td>
<td>Seco Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Drive</td>
<td>Haskell Canyon Road</td>
<td>David Way</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Canyon Road</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites Canyon Road</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockweiler Drive Extension</td>
<td>Lyons Avenue</td>
<td>Existing Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Canyon Road</td>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road</td>
<td>Avenue Scott</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Pines Boulevard</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>Existing Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Town Center North-South Connector</td>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway</td>
<td>Valencia Boulevard</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>Golden Valley Road</td>
<td>Lost Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon Road</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>Medley Ridge Drive</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mileage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>11.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class III Bike Route</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espuella Drive</td>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>End of Road</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Street</td>
<td>Lyons Avenue</td>
<td>Calgrove Boulevard</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerita Canyon Road</td>
<td>Railroad Avenue</td>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Road</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>South City Limits</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>City Limits</td>
<td>Friendly Valley Parkway</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street - Main Street Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>South Fork Trail</td>
<td>6th Street</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Road</td>
<td>Vista Ridge Drive</td>
<td>Calgrove Boulevard</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Mileage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to an overall bikeway network, the 2008 plan recommended more detailed improvements to a series of locations. Projects that have not yet been completed are presented in Table 5-2 below. In some cases, a portion of the recommendations in the projects below have been completed. These projects are identified with asterisks. Project sheets for these projects can be found in section 5.5 at the end of this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class I Bike Paths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue Rail-with-Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Town Center North-South Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail Extension to Lyons Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Trail Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Creek Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class II Bike Lanes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway Bikeway (potential Class III)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillsborough/Grandview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class III Bike Route</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intersection Improvements</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Parkway and Creekside Drive*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Avenue and Peachland Avenue*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Avenue and Avenida Rotella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue Rail-with-Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seco Canyon Road and Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Way and Soledad Canyon Road*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Oak Road and Soledad Canyon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Visibility Crosswalk Installation*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Center Sidewalk Gap Closure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be noted that establishment of a bikeway network does not imply that bicycles should not be accommodated on streets outside of the network. Bicyclists are legally allowed on all City streets and roads regardless of whether the roads are a part of the designated bikeway network or not.

### 5.2. Recommended Pedestrian Network

This plan provides general design guidelines and best practices for developing pedestrian walkways, recommends a sidewalk gap closure program for the Industrial Center, recommends a high-visibility sidewalk installation program, and identifies pedestrian safety improvements for seven key intersections. The intersections were chosen based on pedestrian collision history, proximity to existing pedestrian networks, and proximity to commuter destinations. The intersections identified for improvement are:

- McBean Parkway and Creekside Drive
- Lyons Avenue and Peachland Avenue
• Lyons Avenue and Avenida Rotella
• Railroad Avenue and 15th Street (Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail)
• Seco Canyon Road and Bouquet Canyon Road
• Commuter Way and Soledad Canyon Road
• Intersections of Soledad Canyon Road and Golden Oak, Reuther Avenue and Rainbow Glen Drive

Detailed improvement guidelines are provided at the end of this chapter in Section 5.4.5. Programmatic recommendations to improve sidewalks, paseos and the pedestrian environment are included later in this chapter.

5.3. Targeted Geographic Improvements

The City selected several geographic areas for focused bicycle and pedestrian recommendations. Proposed improvements are identified and described below.

5.3.1. Downtown Newhall

Downtown Newhall is located in the southwestern portion of Santa Clarita, near the intersection of the 5 and 14 freeways. In keeping with the Downtown Newhall Specific Plan, the City has implemented a series of pedestrian improvements to enhance Main Street and has completed construction of the new main branch of the public library on Lyons Avenue. Pedestrian improvements include curb extensions, high visibility crosswalks, and the transformation of Main Street into a pedestrian-friendly environment. Though Main Street in its current state provides a pleasant walking environment, the Downtown lacks pedestrian and bicycle connections to Masters College. The lack of facilities reduces access to the shops and other new businesses in Downtown Newhall, the South Fork Trail, and the new community library. Placerita Canyon and 13th Street do not have sidewalks, and the intersection of 13th Street and Railroad Avenue lacks an ADA-compliant crossing over the railroad tracks. Crosswalks across Railroad Avenue at Lyons Avenue are transverse and thus do not highlight pedestrians in the intersection. In addition, the Downtown lacks bicycle connections to the South Fork Trail and the Newhall Metrolink Station and has no existing bicycle parking outside of the Metrolink Station and the public library. Opportunities to improve connectivity and non-motorized circulation in Downtown Newhall are shown in Figure 5-2 and Figure 5-3 and are described in detail below. These improvements reflect proposed plans for the Master’s College expansion.

In the short-term, sidewalks or unpaved pathways along Placerita Canyon in the public right-of-way and 13th Street, as well as a pedestrian crossing treatment over the train tracks, will improve safety for people who wish to walk between the Downtown and the college. The City may need to work with property owners and the UPRR to install improvements. In addition, improvements at Railroad Avenue and Lyons Avenue would guide pedestrians into Downtown Newhall. High visibility crosswalks would
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increase driver awareness of pedestrians in the intersection and a leading pedestrian interval could be installed if pedestrian volumes warrant. In the long-term, the construction of a planned pedestrian bridge over Newhall Creek, as identified in the college’s Master Plan, would allow pedestrians a more direct linkage to the Downtown via an access point at Market Street.

The City’s 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan proposes a Class III bike route on Placerita Canyon, which would provide the missing link to Masters College. The City could install shared lane markings to enhance the bike route by increasing driver awareness of bicyclists and educating bicyclists on proper lane positioning. A bike boulevard on Main Street and Walnut Street would provide a connection to the South Fork Trail suitable for all bicyclist levels. Shared lane markings, wayfinding signage, and traffic calming measures would further enhance the bicycling environment. A crossing improvement on Market Street at Railroad Avenue would improve connectivity between the Downtown and the train station.

The City has the opportunity to install bicycle racks in the public right-of-way on sidewalks and in under-utilized striped “no-parking” zones. There is also demand for increased bike racks at the train station.
Figure 5-2:  
Downtown Newhall Recommended Improvements
Figure 5-3:  
Downtown Newhall Recommended Bike Boulevard
5.3.2. Santa Clarita Metrolink Station

The Santa Clarita Metrolink Station is located on Soledad Canyon Road at Commuter Way. Bicyclists can access the station from the existing Chuck Pontius Commuter-Rail Trail, which is a paved asphalt bike path along the north side of Soledad Canyon Road. There is a curb cut at the crosswalk across Soledad Canyon Road at Commuter Way for bicyclists to cross and access the Metrolink Station. Sidewalks on either side of Soledad Canyon Road with curb ramps, as well as transverse crosswalks, provide pedestrian access to the station. Most transverse crosswalks are faded.

There is a multi-use path along the west side of Commuter Way that directs bicyclists and pedestrians up to the train platform. The path is accompanied by bike lane signage (R81 CA) and yield to pedestrian signage (W11-2), though signs are not consistently placed on the same post and on the same side of the path. There is also do not enter signage (R5-1) directing motorists to not drive up to the platform; this signage is placed to the right of the pathway, creating potential confusion for bicyclists.

At the top of the incline, there are a series of bike lockers with capacity for approximately 18 bicycles. Two post and ring style bike racks are located near the disabled parking at the bottom of the main staircase to the platform. Motorcyclists use the bike racks to park their motorcycles.

**Figure 5-4** presents recommended bicycle and pedestrian improvements within the Metrolink Station. There is a need for improved signage and wayfinding for pathway users throughout the station, such as directing users to bicycle parking locations and to the Chuck Pontius Commuter-Rail Trail. Additional signage should be installed at the top of the pathway reminding bicyclists to dismount, as the path terminates on the platform where bicycling is not permitted. Striping enhancements are needed along the pathway centerline and crosswalks should be upgraded to high visibility crosswalks. The City should consider allowing bicyclists to cross from the Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail along the west leg and install a leading pedestrian interval. In the long-term, the City should also provide a bicycle path through parking lot to station entrance.

5.3.3. Valencia Industrial Center

The Valencia Industrial Center is located in northwestern Santa Clarita between Interstate 5 and Highway 126. It is home to over 700 businesses and approximately 17,400 employees. Most roadways within the Valencia Industrial Center lack sidewalks. Pedestrians must walk in the street to reach their destinations and public transit riders must wait in the street for buses. The Newhall Ranch Road bike path runs adjacent to the Industrial Center, though there are infrequent connections to the pathway. The Santa Clara River Trail along the southern edge of the Industrial Center has adequate access points, but lacks wayfinding signage to and from those points, as well as path branding. The City striped bike lanes on Avenue Scott and Avenue Stanford, though the Industrial Center has a need for increased on-street bikeways.
Figure 5-4:
Santa Clarita Metrolink Station Recommended Improvements
Figure 5-5 highlights proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements in the Valencia Industrial Center. To enhance pedestrian safety, the City should prioritize improvements along transit routes and streets that connect to the existing network outside the Industrial Center. Improvements could include sidewalks, pathways, or wide striped shoulders. Sidewalk projects should include ADA-accessible curb ramps, driveway reconstruction, tree removal and replanting, landscaping and irrigation, signal modification, and relocation of fire hydrants, traffic signs, and dry utility and water structures. Priority sidewalk installation areas include:

- Avenue Stanford from Newhall Ranch Road to Rye Canyon Road (transit route);
- Rye Canyon Road from Interstate 5 Overpass to Newhall Ranch Road (transit route);
- Avenue Scott from Rye Canyon Road to bridge over San Francisquito Creek (transit route);
- Avenue Tibbitts from Avenue Scott to Newhall Ranch Road (transit route);
- Anza Drive from Avenue Scott to the south end (priority connection).

To improve bicycle access, the City should implement bike lanes on Avenue Tibbitts to connect with the Santa Clara River Trail access point. The City should work with property owners to discuss the feasibility of providing access points to the Newhall Ranch Road bike path on private property. Wayfinding signage at existing and future pathway access points and intersecting bikeways would help non-motorized users navigate the network through the Valencia Industrial Center. In addition to infrastructure improvements, the City could work with businesses to implement programmatic improvements, such as a bicycling user group, to encourage employees to commute by biking or walking.

5.3.4. McBean Regional Transit Center

The McBean Regional Transit Center is at the intersection of McBean Parkway and Valencia Boulevard. Sidewalks, including a direct pathway behind the gas station, provide pedestrian access to the transit center. There are no existing or proposed bikeways in this location.

The City recently expanded the transit center and included better access for bicyclists and pedestrians. The station has 10 bike lockers and bike racks.
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Figure 5-5:
Valencia Industrial Center Recommended Improvements
The City should work with the PTA to keep the existing bike lockers. Because the transit center is a regional transfer center, providing long-term storage for bicycles would benefit commuters.

5.3.5. Valencia Town Center

The Valencia Town Center is located in western Santa Clarita near Interstate 5. As part of Phase I, the developer extended the mall to include “The Patios” by expanding the development (which now includes Macy’s and other large retailers) to the south. Phase II will involve an additional parking structure in the southeastern portion of the property and Phase III will involve an additional five-floor parking structure and anchor retail building in the northeastern portion of the property.

Two paseos terminate at the mall. The southern paseo terminates at the Valencia Boulevard Pedestrian Bridge and the northern paseo terminates at the Magic Mountain Parkway Pedestrian Bridge. However, there is no paseo connection from one side to the other. This is the only gap in the City’s north to south paseo network. The Town Center also lacks a bikeway connection from one side to the other. Because the Valencia Town Center is a key destination, it needs non-motorized facilities on the property and improved bicycle and pedestrian access. Figure 5-6 displays recommended improvements at the mall.

The City should work with the property owner and developers to develop a continuous, safe, well-defined bike connection through the mall parking lot. This may be feasible as a condition from the mall during future buildout of Phase II or III. Several elements are key in creating a functional bikeway through a parking lot, including:

- Separation from vehicles
- Direct connections
- Lighting at night
- Well-marked intersections and crossings
- Clear wayfinding for bicyclists

There are several examples of successful bikeways designed through parking lots nationwide. Palo Alto, for example, has a two-way on-street bikeway through a one-way parking lot adjacent with angled parking. Similarly, Marina del Rey provides a striped two-way bikeway. The Town Center could use similar approaches around the perimeter of the parking lot if the property owner wished to limit bicyclists sharing the road with motorists. In contrast, the 29th Street mall/Target parking lot in Boulder, CO has traditional Class II bike lanes. There may be sufficient width to stripe bike lanes along Ring Road.
Figure 5-6:
Valencia Town Center Recommended Improvements
The City should also work with the property developer to construct an off-street pedestrian connection across or around the mall in the form of a paseo or multi-use path. This would fill in the remaining gap in the north-south paseo network and create continuous off-street pedestrian facilities from the South Fork Trail to Wiley Canyon Road, approximately two miles.

### 5.4. Design and Programmatic Recommendations

This section outlines recommended programs and general design guidelines to make biking and walking in Santa Clarita easier and more enjoyable. Topics addressed include:

- Education Programs  
- Encouragement Programs  
- Community Involvement  
- Citywide and Regional Coordination  
- Pedestrian Facility Improvements  
- Bicycle Parking and End-of-Trip Facilities  
- Maintenance and Operations  
- Signage and Striping  
- Bicycle Signal Detection  
- Safety and Security

#### 5.4.1. Education Programs

It is important to complement bikeway and pedestrian facilities with effective education and encouragement programs to promote biking and walking. Education programs ensure that bicyclists, pedestrians and motorists know how to travel safely and understand the regulations that govern these modes of transportation. Encouragement programs provide fun and creative opportunities for people to “try” biking and walking. Education and encouragement programs also increase the public awareness of bicycling and walking as means of transportation and increase public support for policies that promote biking and walking.

Current educational efforts are provided by the City of Santa Clarita and interested residents. Implementation of the following recommendations will require cooperative efforts among the City of Santa Clarita, the Los Angeles County Sheriff, local school districts, Los Angeles County, local bicycle groups such as the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition and Santa Clarita Velo.

### Recommendations

**Educate Motorists and Bicyclists through a Share the Road Campaign**

A Share the Road campaign is intended to educate motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians about their legal rights and responsibilities on the road, and the need to increase courtesy and cooperation to improve safety. The campaign targets not just youth, but all residents and visitors to a community. The City of Santa Clarita should work with the
Sheriff’s Department, the Los Angeles Bicycle Coalition and other partners to develop a Share the Road Campaign.\textsuperscript{2} To establish a Share the Road campaign, the City of Santa Clarita should:

- **Develop Share the Road flyers**, one targeting bicyclists and pedestrians and one targeting motorists, which outline safe and courteous behavior, collision reporting procedures and local bicycling resources and hotlines.
- **Create public service announcements** on radio and TV to promote the Share the Road campaign, including publicity about the Share the Road checkpoints. Promote the campaign through the City’s e-Notify service and on the City’s website.
- **Develop public PowerPoint presentations** with the Share the Road message for presentation to the public.
- **Develop adult bicycle safety classes** and hold them at regular intervals.

**Continue and Expand Bicycle and Pedestrian Education Programs**

The City of Santa Clarita currently sponsors a bicycle safety class through its recreation program. The City should consider developing a similar educational program for pedestrians and working with the school districts to incorporate this type of safety class into the school curriculum. Typical school-based bicycle and pedestrian education programs educate students about the rules of the road, proper use of bicycle equipment, biking skills, street crossing skills, and the benefits of biking and walking. Education programs can be part of a Safe Routes to School program, and in Santa Clarita, could use the Suggested Routes to School Maps that are developed each year. These types of education programs are usually sponsored by a joint City/school district committee that includes appointed parents, teachers, student representatives, administrators, police, active bicyclists and engineering department staff.

Education need not be limited to younger children. The City’s current bicycle safety classes are available for adults as well as children. The City may consider working with the Sheriff’s Department to utilize adult bicycle education programs as a “bicycle traffic school” in lieu of fines for bicycle or pedestrian-related traffic violations. These courses could be geared toward motorists as well as bicyclists and pedestrians.

**Provide Safety Handbook**

Safety handbooks are generally developed as part of a school-based bicycle and pedestrian safety program. Handbooks and educational programs for adults are also available from League of American Bicyclists,\textsuperscript{3} and bicycle

\textsuperscript{2} Other partners may include local hospitals, schools, or regional and state agencies. For example, the Marin County Bicycle Coalition has partnered with Marin General Hospital, Marin County Law Enforcement and National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to develop its Share the Road Campaign. Marin County Bicycle Coalition’s Share the Road Campaign can be found at www.marinbike.org/Campaigns/ShareTheRoad/Index.shtml The City of San Jose Street Smarts Program is available at: http://www.getstreetsmarts.org/

\textsuperscript{3} The League of American Bicyclists provides online tips for better bicycling at http://www.bikeleague.org/resources/better/index.php
coalitions around the country. Handbooks may include a circulation map of the campus and immediate neighborhood showing the preferred circulation and parking patterns, suggested routes to school, locations of crosswalks, crossing guards and signalized intersections, instructions for bicycle maintenance and use, instructions for fitting and wearing a helmet, instructions for crossing the street, and lists of emergency and school numbers. A general handbook can be published by the City and used by each school in conjunction with the school-specific map.

**Educate Motorists, City Staff, Maintenance and Construction Crews**

Bicycle and pedestrian related education should be targeted to motorists, City staff, developers and others who directly or indirectly affect the biking and walking environment. Information regarding the rights of bicyclists and pedestrians and the rules of the road are especially important. Many motorists mistakenly believe, for example, that bicyclists do not have a right to ride in travel lanes or that bicyclists should only ride on sidewalks. Education about the rights and responsibilities of pedestrians and bicyclists can include:

- Incorporating bicycle and pedestrian safety into traffic school curriculum.
- Producing a brochure on bicycle and pedestrian safety and laws for public distribution.
- Enforcing traffic laws for bicyclists.
- Providing training for bicycle and pedestrian planning for all City planners.
- Working with contractors, subcontractors, and City maintenance and utility crews to ensure they understand the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians and follow standard procedures when working on or adjacent to roadways and walkways.

**5.4.2. Encouragement Programs**

Strategies for community involvement in bicycle and pedestrian improvements will be important to ensure broad-based support to help secure financial resources. Involvement by the private sector in raising awareness of the benefits of bicycling can range from small incremental activities by non-profit groups, to efforts by the largest employers in the City. Specific programs are described below.

**Recommendations**

*Facilitate the Development of Employer Incentive Programs*

Facilitate employer incentive programs to encourage employees to try bicycling and walking to work and include strategies such as providing bicycle lockers and shower facilities, offering more flexible arrival and departure times, and fun incentives such as entry into monthly raffle contests. The City may offer incentives to employers to institute these improvements through air quality credits, lowered parking requirements, reduced traffic mitigation fees, or other means.

A trailhead marker for the Santa Clara River Trail.
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**System Identification (Wayfinding)**
System identification creates greater awareness of the bicycle and pedestrian network and provides wayfinding assistance for cyclists and walkers. System identification usually begins by identification of a series of bicycle and pedestrian routes, development of a unique logo and facility signage, development of a network map and publicity. Signage may also include informational kiosks, directional signage pointing out destinations, and mileage indicators. System identification plans are usually implemented and maintained by the City.

**Community Bikeway/Walkway Adoption**
Community Bikeway/Walkway Adoption programs are similar to the widely instituted Adopt-a-Highway programs throughout the country. These programs identify local individuals, organizations, or businesses that would be interested in “adopting” a bikeway. Adopting a bikeway would mean that person or group would be responsible for maintenance of the bikeway either through direct action or as the source of funding for the City’s maintenance of that bikeway. For example, members of a local recreation group may volunteer every other weekend to sweep a bikeway and identify and address larger maintenance needs. Alternatively, a local bike shop may adopt a bikeway by providing funding for the maintenance costs. The managers of an adopted bikeway may be allowed to post their name on bikeway signs throughout the bikeway in order to display their commitment to bicycling in Santa Clarita.

**Create a Multi-Modal Access Guide**
A multi-modal access guide provides concise customized information on how to access specific destinations with emphasis on biking, walking and transit. Access guides can be as simple as a map printed on the back as a business card or as complex as a multi-page packet distributed to employees. Some items commonly included in access guides are:

- A map of the area with rail and bus stops, recommended walking and biking routes, nearby landmarks, facilities such as restrooms and drinking fountains, locations of bicycle and vehicle parking and major roads.
- Information on transit service including: frequency, fares, accepted methods of payment, first and last runs, schedules, phone numbers and websites of transit service providers and taxis.
- Information on how long it takes to walk or bike from a transit station to a destination.
- Accessibility information for people with disabilities.

Best practices include using graphics, providing specific step-by-step travel directions, providing parking locations and pricing information, and providing information about the benefits of walking and biking. High-quality access guides should be concise and accurate and should incorporate input from key stakeholders, including public transportation operators, public officials, employees, staff who will be distributing the access guide, and those with disabilities. Access guides are usually developed by facility managers, employers or Transportation Management Associations.

**Work with Businesses to Develop Incentives for Biking and Walking**
Incentive programs to encourage biking and walking to local businesses can be developed in coordination with individual businesses, the Chamber of Commerce, the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition and Santa Clarita Velo. Such efforts may include:
• Creating promotional events such as “Bicycle to the Grocery Store” days, when bicyclists get vouchers for, or discounts on items in the store, or “Bicycle to the Video Store” days, when bicyclists receive free popcorn or a discount on a movie rental.

• Holding an annual community event to encourage residents to replace one car trip a week with a bicycle trip.

• Developing, promoting and publicizing bicycle commuter services, such as bike shops selling commute gear, bike-on-transit policies, and regular escorted commute rides.

• Creating an annual commuter challenge for area businesses.

• Encouraging and facilitating the development of small satellite business services near bicycle trailheads such as mobile cafes and stands that sell amenities such as snacks, sunscreen, Band-Aids, and trail maps.

• Encouraging and facilitating the development of lunchtime amenities, such as outdoor lunch areas and satellite or mobile food stations in the Industrial Center.

Continue to Improve Upon Bicycle Friendly Community Award

The League of American Bicyclists sponsors an awards program that recognizes cities and counties that actively support bicycling. According to the League, a Bicycle Friendly Community is one that “provides safe accommodation for cycling and encourages its residents to bike for transportation and recreation.” The league recognizes four tiers of bicycle friendly communities: bronze, silver, gold and platinum. The application process for being considered as a Bicycle Friendly Community involves an audit of the engineering, education, encouragement, enforcement, evaluation and planning efforts for bicycling. The League reviews the application and solicits feedback from bicyclists in the community to determine if Bicycle Friendly Status should be awarded. The League provides technical assistance and other information for cities working toward Bicycle Friendly Community status at: www.bicyclefriendlycommunity.org. The League awarded Santa Clarita the designation of bronze bicycle friendly community in 2007. The City of Santa Clarita should develop an action plan to meet the League of American Cyclist’s requirements to become a silver, gold, and eventually platinum Bicycle Friendly Community.

5.4.3. Community Involvement

Involving the community in visioning, planning and promoting the non-motorized system can ensure that the community’s needs are addressed, can foster support for biking and walking, and can result in a better, more frequently used non-motorized transportation network. Projects with a broad base of support among citizens, staff and elected officials will likely be more easily funded and implemented. City of Santa Clarita residents and employees
can be involved in the development and promotion of the non-motorized network through the following recommendations:

**Recommendations**

*Continued to Support Bike-to-Work and Bike-to-School Days*

The City of Santa Clarita should continue its participation in the annual Bike-to-Work day in May, in conjunction with the Los Angeles County and California bike-to-work week activities. City staff should be present at “energizer” stations along the route. Local Bike-and-Walk-to-School days can be held annually in conjunction with bicycle education programs.

*Continue to Support Bike Fairs and Races*

Hosting bike fairs and races in Santa Clarita, such as the Amgen Bike Tour of California that the City hosted in 2007, 2008, 2009, 2011, and 2013, can raise the profile of bicycling in the area and provide entertainment for all ages. Bike fairs and races provide an opportunity to educate and encourage current and potential bicyclists. These events can also bring visitors to Santa Clarita that may contribute to the local economy. These events could be sponsored and implemented through collaboration between City and local employers.

*Establish a Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee*

Establishing a community-based bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee allows community members to become directly involved in the process of developing and improving the existing bicycle and pedestrian networks. As regular users of Santa Clarita’s bicycle and pedestrian network, members of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee are in a unique position to highlight areas of concern that the City may not have identified.

**5.4.4. Citywide and Regional Coordination**

Bicycle and pedestrian planning, facility construction, and programming in Santa Clarita are currently conducted by many different entities. Santa Clarita has an extensive trail and paseo network, and has plans to develop this network through City-funded improvements, road extension projects, and developer-funded efforts. The City is an active participant in Bike-to-Work Day events, and City of Santa Clarita Transit recently upgraded its bus fleet with bike racks. The Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition is actively involved in monitoring the bicycling environment in Santa Clarita and recommending improvements. Segments of some streets are located within the County of Los Angeles, while other streets are under Caltrans jurisdiction. There is a need for coordination between these different entities.
Recommendations

**Fund a City Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Coordinator**

To take full advantage of bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts in Santa Clarita, and to assist with implementation of the many projects and programs recommended in this Plan, the City of Santa Clarita may wish to consider hiring or designating a Bicycle and Pedestrian Program Coordinator. This position could be a new full or part-time staff person, or the duties of a bicycle and pedestrian coordinator could be assigned to an existing staff person on a part-time basis. The job duties for this staff person may include monitoring the design and construction of bikeways, trails and paseos including those constructed in conjunction with private development projects, ensuring bicycle and pedestrian facilities identified in specific plans and as mitigation measures are designed appropriately and constructed expediently, coordinating the implementation of the recommended projects and programs listed in this Plan, identifying new projects, and creating and staffing a city bicycle and pedestrian advisory committee.

**Continue to Coordinate with Los Angeles County, Caltrans and other Agencies to Expand the Regional Bikeway Network**

Expanding and enhancing the regional bikeway network is an important part of making bicycling a viable commute mode. Santa Clarita’s employers attract employees from outside the City limits, while some City residents are commuting to jobs in San Fernando Valley and Los Angeles. The City of Santa Clarita should actively encourage and facilitate the construction and improvement of bikeway facilities on regionally important routes. The City should place a high priority on filling in gaps in the regional network as identified in the Los Angeles County Bicycle Master Plan. Regionally important bikeway facilities include, but are not limited to the extension of San Francisquito Creek Trail north to Castaic Lake, extension of the Santa Clara River Trail, The Old Road and Sierra Highway.

5.4.5. Pedestrian Facility Improvements

A complete, connected and safe pedestrian network creates a pleasant walking environment and is important in encouraging more people to walk for everyday trips. A sidewalk gap closure program and intersection improvement program will enhance the safety and aesthetics of Santa Clarita’s pedestrian network.

**Recommendations**

**Establish a Sidewalk Gap Closure Program**

Though most of Santa Clarita’s roadways have adjacent sidewalks, some areas lack complete sidewalk networks. For example, sidewalks are not present in the industrial area, along some major roadways in Newhall, and, in keeping with rural design standards, are not required along rural residential roads. The City should develop a program that identifies gaps in the existing sidewalk network, creates a list of prioritized gap closure projects, and constructs a certain number of projects annually. The City should work with the communities to develop sidewalk designs that are context-sensitive and appropriate for each area. The City should work with residents of rural roadways on a case-by-case basis to provide sidewalks to schools and transit stops. The City may want to consider alternative surface treatments for sidewalks in rural areas. Sidewalk construction should be prioritized to increase access to schools, parks, shopping areas and transit stops.
Establish an Intersection Improvement Program

An intersection improvement program can be used to identify and prioritize intersections that warrant improved signage, striping and signal timing. Intersections may be prioritized based on pedestrian volumes, collision history, public input, and proximity to schools, trails, parks and shopping centers. The improvement program should identify uniform crossing design standards to be used throughout the city at locations where trails cross roadways and driveways. Establishing a unified standard will alert motorists to the presence of pedestrians and bicyclists.

5.4.6. Bicycle Parking and End-of-Trip Facilities

Bicycle parking includes standard bike racks, covered lockers, and corrals. Bicycle parking should be installed on public property, or available to private entities on an at-cost basis. Showers and lockers are essential end-of-trip facilities, providing comfort and greater security for commuters, and encourage more people to bicycle to work. A systematic program to improve the quality and increase the quantity of bicycle end-of-trip facilities should be implemented in Santa Clarita.

Recommendations

Increase Public Bicycle Parking Facilities

Santa Clarita’s three Metrolink Stations, City Hall, and the McBean Regional Transit Center already provide bicycle lockers and racks. Bike racks and lockers should be provided at other public destinations, including community centers, parks, schools and shopping centers. All bicycle parking should be in a safe, secure area visible to passersby. Commuter locations should provide secure indoor parking, covered bicycle corrals, or Class I bicycle lockers. Bicycle parking on sidewalks in commercial areas should be provided according to specific design criteria, reviewed by merchants and the public, and installed as demand warrants. Generally, ‘U’ type racks bolted into the sidewalk are preferred and should be located intermittently or in front of key destinations. Bicycle racks should be installed to meet ADA standards and not block pedestrian through traffic.

The City may want to consider custom racks that can serve not only as bike racks, but also public artwork or as advertising for a specific business. The “post and ring” style rack is an attractive alternative to the standard inverted-U, which requires only a single mounting point and can be customized to have the city name or emblem stamped into the rings. These racks can also be easily retrofitted onto existing street posts, such as parking meter posts. While custom racks can add a decorative element and relate to a neighborhood theme, the rack function should not be overlooked: All racks should adhere to the basic functional requirement of supporting the bicycle by the frame (not only the wheel) and accepting a U-lock.
At City-sponsored events, bicycle valet parking should be provided. The City may be able to partner with a local group, such as the Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition, to provide free, secure bicycle and stroller valet parking.

**Encourage Provision of Shower and Locker Facilities**

Encouraging employers to provide shower and locker facilities for employees should be a component of all commute and traffic demand management programs as these facilities provide for current commuters and may encourage more commuters to ride their bicycles. Several cities require shower and locker facilities as a condition of development approval. Bicyclists are not the only employees that may benefit from shower and locker facilities; these facilities are useful for employees who wish to run or exercise on a work break. The City should also consider providing shower and changing facilities at City Hall for employees.

**Encourage Provision of Bicycle Air Stations**

Ensuring that bicycle tires are properly inflated is one of the most important maintenance items for a bicyclist. While gas stations typically provide air compressors, providing publicly accessible air stations at major bicycling destinations can help is a way of enhancing the bikeway network. Public bicycle air stations are already in use in popular cycling cities such as Davis, California, and they have been found to be well-used by cyclists, vandal-resistant and low-maintenance. In Santa Clarita, logical locations for public bicycle air stations include trailheads along the Santa Clara River Trail, and at the major transit stops. Major local employers should also be encouraged to provide bicycle air stations along with their secure bicycle parking facilities.

**5.4.7. Maintenance and Operations**

Both on-street and off-street bikeways need regular maintenance. Santa Clarita’s on-street bikeways are maintained as part of regular street maintenance activities by the Environmental Services Division and off-street trails are maintained jointly by the Parks Department and the Public Works Department. The City also repairs bikeways as they are notified of issues, and is very responsive to requests.

On-street bikeways require specialized maintenance and, in general, greater attention to detail. Bicycles are more susceptible than motor vehicles to roadway irregularities such as potholes and loose gravel. For example, after
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repaving, a roadway lip between a gutter pan and asphalt does not affect a motor vehicle, but can easily catch a bicycle tire and possibly result in a bicyclist losing control of the bicycle.

Construction activities in Santa Clarita present additional maintenance requirements. Construction affects bicyclists through increased roadway wear due to heavy vehicle traffic and increased debris such as sand and gravel from construction equipment. In addition to maintenance issues, construction activities may also hinder bicyclists if Class II lanes are closed off or obstructed due to road maintenance, landscaping or other construction activities. Special accommodations may be made to provide for cyclists during construction periods.

**Recommendations**

*Develop a Maintenance Policy that Addresses the Special Needs of Bicyclists*

The City of Santa Clarita should evaluate its current street maintenance and repair policies to ensure that they reflect the needs of bicyclists. Specific measures to review include:

**Street sweeping.** As motor vehicles travel along the roadway, debris is pushed to the outside lanes and shoulder. Debris also collects at the center of intersections. Roads striped with bike lanes or designated as bicycle routes should be swept more frequently than roads without designated bikeways. Street sweeping on these roadways should include removing debris on the shoulder and at intersections.

**Minor repairs and improvements.** Potholes and cracks along the shoulder of roadways primarily affect bicyclists and should be completed within a timely manner. All repairs should be flush to the existing pavement surface.

**Street resurfacing.** When streets with bikeways are resurfaced, utility covers, grates and other in-street items should be brought up to the new level of pavement. Similarly, the new asphalt should be tapered to meet the gutter edge and provide a smooth transition between the roadway and the gutter pan.

**Proactive identification of and response to maintenance needs.** The City currently uses the eService Online Request System to identify needed repairs to roadways and bikeways. The City should promote this hotline. In addition to this hotline, the City should proactively identify locations in need of maintenance. Maintenance needs should include street sweeping, minor repairs and improvements, identification of hazards such as sunken utility covers or drainage grates with openings parallel to the roadway, and identification of bikeway facilities in need of restriping or resigning.

**Calibrate bicycle loop detectors.** As part of general maintenance, the City should test and calibrate bicycle-sensitive loop detectors to ensure that they are working properly. Loop detectors are described in more detail below.

**Actively coordinate with maintenance workers.** The City should ensure that maintenance workers are aware of new bicycle related maintenance policies. Maintenance workers should be involved in the development of bicycle related maintenance policies in order to ensure that City staff and maintenance workers understand each other's needs and limitations. After establishing policies, the City should follow up with the maintenance staff to verify compliance and to modify policies or provide additional support, if necessary, to ensure future compliance.
Consider impacts on bicycles while performing construction, maintenance and repair work on roadways and trails.

Construction and maintenance activities present challenges for cyclists; even the most experienced cyclists may feel anxiety when the bike lane is unexpectedly blocked by construction activities and they are forced out into travel lanes with vehicles that may be traveling in excess of 45 mph. While cyclists are permitted by the California Vehicle Code to leave the bike lane if it is obstructed, motorists may not be expecting them to merge left into the travel lane. For construction activities:

- If feasible, avoid parking construction or maintenance vehicles in bicycle lanes or on designated bicycle routes.
- Provide suitable construction warning signs for any activities that involve work in a designated bikeway. Signage should warn bicyclists well in advance of any location where the bicycle lane is closed for construction or maintenance activities.
- If possible, maintain a coned-off area between the construction zone and vehicle lane for bicycle travel. A 5’ area is optimal, but even a 3’ area would provide cyclists room to maneuver past the construction activities without forcing them into the travel lane.
- Where necessary, provide detour routes around areas undergoing construction.
- The city should sign and enforce reduced speed limits around construction zones to ensure that motorists passing these areas are traveling at a safe speed.

5.4.8. Signage and Striping

All bikeway signage and striping on public roadways in Santa Clarita should conform to the signage identified in the 2012 California MUTCD. These documents give specific information on the type and location of signing for bicycle facilities in California. The following recommendations are for signage that goes beyond basic MUTCD requirements.

**Recommendations**

**Designated Bikeway Signs**

The installation of bikeway signs on all designated bicycle facilities is important to heighten motorist awareness of cyclists and help cyclists find their way. The City should ensure that all bikeways are signed per the 2012 California MUTCD.

**Destination Signage**

Destination signage makes it easier for pedestrians and bicyclists to use the trail and on-street bikeway network as an effective transportation system. Destination signs typically display distance, direction and in some cases, estimated travel time information. The City should design and install custom destination signage on major trails and on-street bikeways and paseos. A signage plan should be developed to ensure that destination signage is complete, coherent and does not result in sign clutter. Destination signage in Santa Clarita could direct trail users to destinations such as the Valencia Town Center, Jan Heidt Newhall Metrolink Station, Bouquet Canyon Bicycle Lanes, or shopping...
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Consider a Pilot Program to Test Parallel Path Warning Signage

When paths are located parallel and adjacent to roadways, vehicles turning into and out of streets and driveways must cross the path. Conflicts between bicyclists and pedestrians and turning motorists are common at these types of intersections. Turning motor vehicles do not expect to see bicyclists or pedestrians coming in the opposite direction of traffic. Starting in the early 1990s, the City of Denver, Colorado began using experimental warning signage at its parallel paths. The signage is modified from the standard MUTCD railroad warning signage. The City of Santa Clarita should consider a pilot program to test the effectiveness of experimental warning signage alerting motorists to the presence of bicyclists and pedestrians on parallel paths. This would involve the City working with the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) through their process for implementing and testing “experimental” signage.

5.4.9. Bicycle Signal Detection

The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) adopted Traffic Operations Policy Directive 09-06, which requires that new and modified signal detectors provide bicyclist detection if they are to remain in operation. Further, the standard states that new and modified bicycle path approaches to signalized intersections provide bicyclist detection or a bicyclist pushbutton if detection is required. Santa Clarita uses in-pavement loop detectors and video detection at signalized intersections to trigger traffic lights. Video detection systems and certain loop detectors can be calibrated to respond to the presence of a bicycle. The following recommendations are intended to improve bicycle detection at signalized intersections.

Recommendations

Continue to Install Bicycle-Sensitive Detection at Signalized Intersections

The City has been installing bicycle-sensitive detection in bike lanes at signalized intersections over the past several years. The City should continue to install bicycle-sensitive detection at intersections during roadway construction. Since many people do not know how loop...
detectors work, if the City chooses to use this method of detection it may be necessary at some locations to mark a pavement stencil that shows cyclists where to stop to activate the loop. Stencils should be repainted when needed. As opportunities arise, loop detector stencils should be installed in coordination with striping maintenance or resurfacing projects.

Standard bicycle detection markings should be applied so that bicyclists can be detected in the limit line detection zone as per Caltrans Policy Directive 09-06. The State standard bicycle detection marking appears on Caltrans Standard Plan A24C.

To increase understanding about how to use bicycle loop detectors, the City may want to include information about how to activate a bicycle loop detector in its bicycle educational materials.

Regularly Calibrate Bicycle-Sensitive Detection

While bicycle-sensitive detection facilitates faster and more convenient bicycle trips, if it is not calibrated properly, or stops functioning, it can frustrate bicyclists waiting for signals to change, unaware that the detection is not working. The City should ensure that all bicycle-sensitive detection is tested, calibrated, and operable as part of routine signal maintenance.

5.4.10. Safety and Security

The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department should continue to perform enforcement of applicable laws on bike paths, depending on available resources and priorities. Enforcement of vehicle statutes relating to bicycle operation will be enforced on Class II and Class III bikeways as part of the department’s normal operations.

Recommendations

Increase Safety and Security through Proper Design and Maintenance

The following recommendations emphasize safety and security through design and maintenance efforts. These actions should be incorporated into the planning and development process of all bicycle facilities.

- Adhere to the established Federal and State design, operation, and maintenance standards (See Appendices C, D and E for an overview of these standards)
- Supplement these standards with the sound judgment of professional planners, public safety officials and engineers.
- Maintain adequate recording and response mechanisms for reported safety and maintenance problems.
- Provide regular police patrols to the extent needed.
- Continue to support the Sheriff’s existing bicycle registration program and training for proper locking techniques.
- Thoroughly research the causes of each reported collision within the City of Santa Clarita’s bicycle and pedestrian network. Respond to accident investigations with appropriate design or operation improvements.
5. Recommended Improvements

Bicycle Patrol Unit

The City of Santa Clarita may want to work with the Sheriff’s Department, business districts and neighborhood groups to establish local Bicycle Patrol Units. A Bicycle Patrol Unit may be an official law enforcement unit, a private security guard patrol, or a volunteer network. Bicycles are an excellent community-policing tool, as officers on bikes are often viewed as more approachable, thus improving trust and relations between the citizens and police. Bicycle patrol units can work closely with citizens to address concerns before they become problems. Bicycle patrol units can have a direct impact on bicycle safety by enforcing bicycle traffic laws (e.g. wrong-way riding, sidewalk riding, obeying traffic controls, children wearing helmets), and providing bicycle safety education.

In addition to developing a bicycle patrol unit, the Sheriff’s Department officers should become familiar with the trail network, including trailheads and trail locations. With the implementation of a mile-marker system recommended in the “Destination Signage” recommendation above, it will be easier for trail users to report their location to the Sheriff’s Department in the event of an emergency.

It is recommended that the Sheriff’s Department proactively enforce bicycle and pedestrian related violations at high-crash areas. This spot enforcement should be highly visible, and publicly advertised. It may take the form of crosswalk stings, handing out informational sheets to motorists, cyclists and pedestrians, or enforcing speed limits and right-of-way at trail-roadway intersections.

Continue a Safe Routes to School Program

In 2008, the City of Santa Clarita began the process of developing its citywide program, funded by the State of California Safe Routes to Schools grant money. The project serves as a comprehensive program covering education, encouragement, enforcement, engineering and evaluation, and involved reaching out to all of the City’s 27 elementary schools. The City should continue the program by implementing improvements at all elementary schools and expanding the program to include middle/junior high and high schools (discussed in Chapter 8).

5.5. Project Sheets

The following pages present projects from the 2008 plan that have not yet been completed. These projects are also identified in Table 5-2.
## Class I Bike Path: Railroad Avenue Rail With Trail

### Project Description
Construct paved multi-use path on east side of Railroad Avenue between road and Union Pacific rail line from 13th Street to Magic Mountain Parkway. May require grade separated crossing at Via Princesa, enhanced at-grade crossings at Oak Ridge Drive, and Drayton Street. Connection to South Fork Trail to be provided at Magic Mountain Parkway would require grade separated crossing. If possible, extend along railroad to Metrolink Station or to proposed Soledad Canyon Road Commuter Trail South.

### Improvements Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Limited right of way between tracks and roadway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Right of way will need to be secured from Metrolink.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Crossing Oak Ridge Drive and Drayton Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Businesses located in ROW will need to be relocated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Existing bridge over Placerita Creek is narrow.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● High traffic speeds and volumes along Railroad Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Access to trail requires crossing Railroad Avenue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Looking North on Railroad Avenue.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Options:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Study feasibility of widening bridge over Placerita Creek.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● High visibility crosswalks at roadway crossings.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Warning signage at intersections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● Install bicycle loop detectors at signals that are traffic actuated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cost Estimate

**Total estimated cost:** $1,820,000

Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Class I Bike Path: South Fork Trail Extension to Lyons Avenue

Project Description

Construct paved multi-use path on south side of flood control channel between Orchard Village Road and Lyons Avenue (outside of City’s right-of-way). The connection between the existing South Fork Trail and the extension across Orchard Village Road could be done at midblock or path users could be directed to the light at 16th Street.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- Crossing Orchard Village Road.
- Narrow bridge over Flood Control channel.
- Right of Way may need to be secured from Orchard Village II HOA and Edison for connection to 16th Street crossing.

Improvement Options:
- New trail undercrossing at Orchard Village, requiring coordination with County Public Works.
- In short-term, trail users could cross Orchard Village by routing to use nearby existing signalized crossing at 16th Street. If so, sidewalks should be widened to allow bicycle access.
- Warning signage at intersections.
- Directional signage for trail users.

Cost Estimate

Total estimated cost: $980,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Class I Bike Path: Valencia Town Center North-South Connector

**Project Description**
Construct a continuous, safe, well-defined bike connection through the mall parking lot or an off-street pedestrian connection across or around the mall in the form of a paseo or multi-use path. This project is one of two that would fill a gap in the north-south paseo network that runs from Lyons Avenue to Copper Hill Drive. Project may be feasible to develop as a condition from the mall during future buildout.

**Improvements Summary**

**Issues:**
- Future development plans may restrict options.
- User conflicts between pedestrians and mall traffic.
- On private property.

**Improvement Options:**
- Install paseo or path along shopping center perimeter road, approximately 0.4 miles in length.
- High-visibility crosswalks.
- Warning signage for motorists.
- Provide wayfinding signage.
- Work with developers to incorporate pathway into future mall expansion plans.

*A path could be placed outside parking lot.*

**Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources**
Project may be feasible to develop as a condition from the mall during future buildout.
Class I Bike Path: River Trail Extension

Project Description
Construct Class I path from end of the trail at Discovery River Park to the end of existing development. The City will construct this segment of the River Trail. Future segments of the River Trail extending to Bouquet Canyon Road will be developed as part of future developer-funded projects.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
▲ Flooding risk.
▲ Future development of Park.

Improvement Options:
▲ Construct trail along existing flood maintenance road.
▲ Coordinate trail construction with future developments, River Village and Keystone.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources
Total estimated cost: $499,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Class I Bike Path: Bouquet Canyon Creek Trail

Project Description

Construct paved multi-use path along the south side of Bouquet Canyon Creek from North City Limits to intersection of Alamogordo Road and Bouquet Canyon Road. Trail to be extended to Central Park. Crossings are required at Benz Road (at grade), Urbandale Ave (at grade), Haskell Canyon Road (grade separated), Centurion Way (at grade), Los Angeles Aqueduct and Bouquet Canyon Road (grade separated). Second Phase of the project involves extension of trail through Central Park, south of existing residential and commercial development to connect with proposed Newhall Ranch Road bike path and Santa Clara River Trail. Phase II may be implemented by connecting through Espuella Drive (develop as bike route or bicycle boulevard), constructing a multi-use path to the south of the commercial area at Bouquet Canyon Road and Newhall Ranch Road or may be implemented by constructing a multi-use path on the existing unpaved maintenance road south of the existing development. It may be feasible for future development to fund and construct Phase II of this trail.

Improvements Summary

Issues:

▲ Multiple road crossings.
▲ Crossing of Los Angeles Aqueduct.
▲ Crossing of tributary.
▲ Lack of right-of-way between Central Park and Santa Clara River Road.
▲ Maintenance road ends south of Los Angeles Aqueduct.
▲ Privacy concerns of adjacent property owners.

Improvement Options:

▲ Construct Class I path along existing maintenance trail on north bank of Bouquet Canyon Creek.
▲ Construct high-visibility at-grade trail crossings at Benz Road, Urbandale Avenue, and Centurion Way.
▲ Construct undercrossing at Haskell Canyon Road.
▲ Construct bridge over Aqueduct, or consider bringing trail out to Bouquet Canyon to cross aqueduct.
▲ Construct undercrossing of Bouquet Canyon Road.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources

Total estimated cost:
-Phase I to Park: $2,520,000
-Phase II to Espuella: $280,000
-Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Class I Bike Path: McBean Bridge Upgrade

Project Description

The McBean Bridge crosses over the Santa Clara River, the South Fork Trail and the Santa Clara River Trail. The bridge presently accommodates eight vehicle lanes and a sidewalk on the east side. This project is currently under construction.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- Limited right-of-way width.
- Heavy motor vehicle volumes on McBean Parkway
- Existing pedestrian facility not sufficient to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians
- Provides access to Santa Clara River Trail and South Fork Trail

Improvement Options:
- Widen McBean Bridge to accommodate a 10 foot bicycle path with 42 inch railing between bikeway and motor vehicle lanes
- Improvement option is planned as part of widening McBean Bridge from 6 lanes to 8 lanes

Cost Estimate

Total estimated cost:
- Bridge widening: 590’x26’ at $300/sf
- $4,602,000 construction
- 15% contingency
- 15% design
- 15% construction management
- $6,700,000 TOTAL
Class II or Class III Bicycle Facility: Sierra Highway Bikeway

Project Description
Sierra Highway provides the primary north-south bicycle route between Newhall and Canyon Country and is currently used by road cyclists. The roadway is identified as a regionally important bikeway in the Los Angeles County Bicycle Transportation Strategic Plan. Sierra Highway currently has wide shoulders and a wide center turn lane from the south City limits to Friendly Valley Parkway, with on-street parking allowed on some segments. Approximately half a mile of time-restricted bike lanes exist on Sierra Highway between Friendly Valley Parkway and just south of Vista Del Canon (near Via Prinvenida). Between Vista Del Canon and Soledad Canyon Road, Sierra Highway runs through a commercial area and is striped for three lanes of traffic in both directions with no shoulder, making it a challenging riding environment. North of Soledad Canyon Road, lanes drop to two through lanes in both directions, with a wide outside lane.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- Future plans to add a third travel lane to sections with 2 lanes in either direction.
- Gap between Via Prinvenida and Soledad Canyon Road.

Improvement Options:
- Short-Term: Sign Sierra Highway between The Old Road and existing bike lanes as Bike Route. Cyclists can use existing shoulder areas for riding. Stripe bicycle lanes on Sierra Highway north of Soledad Canyon Road to County’s proposed bike lanes on Vasquez Canyon Road. Portions of these roads are in unincorporated County and will require implementation by the County.
- Long-Term: If the City determines in the future it is necessary to stripe an additional vehicle travel lane in each direction on Sierra Highway, study bikeway options at the time the restriping project is to take place. Two main options exist: 1) Keep roadway as a bike route, using narrow lane widths (e.g. 11 foot lanes) to provide as much shoulder as possible with the restriping. A minimum 3-4 foot striped shoulder may provide cyclists with sufficient room on this segment. Or 2) Stripe “Time of Day” bike lanes, in which the 3rd Travel lane is designated as a Bike Lane during off-peak hours, and functions as a vehicle travel lane during commute hours. While this has the advantage of a full bike lane during the non-peak periods, the disadvantage is that it provides no bikeway on the roadway during the commute period, which is the most likely period for bicyclists heading toward the San Fernando Valley to be using Sierra Highway.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources
Total estimated cost: $145,000 (bike route –signage only) $68,000 (1.7 miles of time-restricted bike lanes)
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review. The roadway between Via Prinvenida and Soledad Canyon Road is physically constrained and will require additional study and work to bring up to bike route standards. Additional work not included in cost.
Class III Bike Route: Valley Street Bike Route

Project Description
Orchard Village Road and Valley Street serve Henry Mayo Newhall Memorial Hospital, William S. Hart High School and Newhall Park, and connect to Valencia paseos and the South Fork Trail. Orchard Village Road, which lies north of Lyons Avenue, was signed as a bike route by the City since the adoption of the 2008 Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. South of Lyons Avenue, the roadway continues as Valley Street, a wide two-lane residential street. Valley Street connects to existing bicycle lanes on Calgrove Boulevard. Sidewalks are not provided along most of the length of these two roadways. Cyclists, including families with younger children, currently use this route. Orchard Village Road is designated as a major arterial in the City General Plan and is indicated as eventually having 6 lanes, which would eliminate the existing wide shoulder.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
▲ Future road widening to three lanes in each direction.
▲ Narrow bridge at South Fork River Bridge.
▲ McBean Parkway does not have bicycle facilities.
▲ Crossing Lyons Avenue.

Improvement Options:
▲ Orchard Village Road Overcrossing at South Fork: Existing bridge may be too narrow to accommodate cyclists. Consider options for accommodation, including using sidepath or widening bridge.
▲ Valley Street South of Lyons Avenue: Sign as Class III bike route.
▲ Locked Gate at Valley Street: Install signs stating bikes and pedestrians are permitted.
▲ Orchard Village Road and Mill Valley Road: Provide wayfinding signage from roadway to Valencia paseo network.
▲ Orchard Village Road and South Fork Trail: Provide wayfinding signage to South Fork Trail.
▲ Design future road widening to maintain bicycle accommodations.
▲ Install high-visibility crosswalks at Lyons Avenue crossing.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources
Total estimated cost: $25,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Class III Bike Route: Wiley Canyon Bicycle Route

Project Description

Wiley Canyon Road south of Lyons Avenue is a two-lane roadway that travels along the edge of a residential area. The road provides a major commute route for bicyclists traveling from Valencia to San Fernando Valley via The Old Road. The roadway narrows south of Fourl Road, widens at Canerwell Street, and connects to the bicycle lanes on Calgrove Boulevard.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- Road narrows south of Fourl Road.

Improvement Options:
- Wiley Canyon Road from Lyons Avenue to Calgrove Boulevard: Stripe wide shoulders and sign as bike route. Include warning signage where road narrows.
- Study feasibility of striping and signing bicycle lanes.
- Evaluate methods to reduce vehicle speeds.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources

Total estimated cost: $30,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Class III Bike Route: Sand Canyon Road Bicycle Route

**Project Description**

Sand Canyon Road is an extremely popular bicycle route, especially for cyclists riding the Sand Canyon - Placerita Canyon loop ride. Given the popularity of this route with local cyclists, it is recommended that this roadway be designated as a Class III Bike Route, and signed accordingly.

**Improvements Summary**

**Issues:**
- Heavily used recreational bike route.
- Lack of shoulder width to accommodate bike lanes.

**Improvement Options:**
- Class III signed bike route.
- Install “Share the Road” signs along route.
- Connect to proposed bike route along Placerita Canyon Road (County jurisdiction).

**Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources**

Total estimated cost: $82,500
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvement: McBean Parkway and Creekside Drive

Project Description
The intersection of McBean Parkway and Creekside Drive is a busy intersection that has a US Post Office on the northeast corner, a Target store on the southeast corner, and a shopping plaza driveway that serves as the intersection’s western leg. Bus stops are located nearby, as is the Santa Clara River Trail. Pedestrians crossings are prohibited on the north leg of the intersection across McBean.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- High traffic volumes and speeds.
- High turning movement volumes.

Improvement Options:
- Install high-visibility crosswalks.
- Install “Right Turn Yield to Pedestrians” signs.
- Consider Leading Pedestrian Interval timing across McBean.
- Consider removing pedestrian crossing restriction across north leg.

Aerial view of Creekside Drive and McBean Parkway.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources
Total estimated cost: $15,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvements: Lyons Avenue and Peachland Avenue

Project Description

Lyons Avenue and Peachland Avenue form a T-intersection adjacent to Old Orchard Park. Residents that live south of Lyons Avenue must cross at this intersection to access the park. Peachland Avenue also serves an elementary school, and so this intersection sees a lot of school-related vehicle and pedestrian traffic. Currently pedestrians are not allowed to cross the west leg of the intersection across Lyons Avenue. The intersection is bordered by a bank and a small shopping center.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- High traffic volumes and speeds.
- High turning movement volumes.

Improvement Options:
- Install high-visibility crosswalk striping.
- Install Countdown signal heads.
- Install “Right Turn Yield to Pedestrians” signs on Peachland Avenue.
- Install left turn arrow on south leg.
- Install advance stop lines at crosswalks, with left turn lane stop line farther back than the stop bar for right-turning vehicles (on Peachland Avenue).
- Consider advance pedestrian signal for pedestrians crossing Lyons Avenue.
- Consider removing pedestrian crossing restrictions.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources

Total estimated cost: $10,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvements: Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail

**Project Description**

Once the Railroad Avenue Trail with Rail is constructed, Newhall and Valencia residents will have to cross Railroad Avenue to access the trail. As part of the development of the Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail, the City should consider intersection improvements at all access points along the trail. The improvements identified for the intersection of 15th Street and Railroad Avenue will generally be applicable at all T-intersections along the trail.

Railroad Avenue and 15th Street intersect at a T near Downtown Newhall. The intersection is signalized. Pedestrians are not allowed to cross on the north leg of the intersection (across Railroad Avenue). A bus stop is located to the north of the intersection, on the east side of Railroad Avenue. Railroad Avenue will become a six-lane arterial in the near future.

**Improvements Summary**

**Issues:**
- High traffic volumes and speeds.
- Curb ramp lacking on east side of crosswalk.
- No sidewalk connecting adjacent bus stop pad not connected to crosswalk.

**Improvement Options:**
- Install high-visibility crosswalks.
- Install advance stop lines at crosswalks.
- Install “Right Turn Yield to Pedestrians” signs on 15th Avenue.
- Install curb ramp on east side of Railroad Avenue.
- Construct sidewalk between crosswalk and existing bus stop.
- Consider Leading Pedestrian Interval timing for crossing Railroad Avenue.
- Consider removing pedestrian crossing restrictions.

*Looking across Railroad Avenue at 15th Street.*

**Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources**

Total estimated cost: $16,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvements: Seco Canyon Road and Bouquet Canyon Road

Project Description
Seco Canyon Road and Bouquet Canyon Road come together at a signalized T intersection. Both roadways have significant traffic volumes and speeds. Pedestrians are not allowed to cross the west leg of the intersection (Bouquet Canyon Road). Double left turn lanes funnel vehicles from Bouquet Canyon Road to Seco Canyon Road and double right turn lanes funnel vehicles from Seco Canyon Road to Bouquet Canyon Road. The southbound bicycle lanes on Bouquet Canyon Road end just north of this intersection. The northbound bicycle lanes narrow but continue.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
▲ High traffic volumes and speeds.
▲ Pedestrians restricted from crossing the west leg of intersection.
▲ Curb cuts not provided on south side of intersection.

Improvement Options:
▲ Install high-visibility crosswalks.
▲ Install advance pedestrian signal for pedestrians.
▲ Install “Left Turn Yield to Pedestrians” signs for eastbound Bouquet Canyon traffic.
▲ Install curb cuts on south side of intersection.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources
Total estimated cost: $14,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvements: Commuter Way and Soledad Canyon Road

Project Description

At the Santa Clarita Metrolink Station, Commuter Way intersects Soledad Canyon Road at a signalized T intersection. Bicyclists and pedestrians using the bicycle path that runs along the north side of Soledad Canyon Road must cross at this intersection to access the train station which is south of Soledad Canyon Road. Pedestrian crossing is not permitted on the west leg of the intersection. Trail users are directed to use the east leg of the intersection. A bicycle path parallels commuter way on the west side and leads behind the train station to bicycle lockers.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- Relatively high bicycle and pedestrian volumes, accessing Metrolink Station from bike path.
- Pedestrians restricted from crossing the west leg of intersection.
- High vehicle turning volumes.
- Pedestrian and bicycle bridge proposed as part of River Village development.

Improvement Options:
- Install high-visibility crosswalks.
- Install perpendicular curb ramps on southeast corner to better facilitate pedestrian/bike access onto walkway.
- Consider allowing cyclists to cross west leg of intersection and providing leading pedestrian interval.
- Improve signage on pathway and platform
- Restripe pathway centerline striping
- Long-term: Provide bicycle path through parking lot to station entrance.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources

Total estimated cost: $30,000 (Pedestrian and bicycle bridge not included in cost estimate.)
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvement: Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail

Project Description
The Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail parallels Soledad Canyon Road for much of its length. The trail is intersected by several roadways. This project will improve the trail-roadway interface at two of these intersections: Ruther Avenue, Rainbow Glen Drive. (Recommendations for improving the intersection of Soledad Canyon Road and Golden Oak Road are on a separate project sheet).

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- Trail crossing of multi-lane roadway, with multiple turn

Imrovement Options:
- Install advance stop lines at least 5 feet back of crosswalk at trail crossing.
- Prohibit right turn on red on northbound Reuther Avenue and Rainbow Glen Drive.
- Stripe high visibility crosswalk across Reuther Avenue and Rainbow Glen Drive.
- Install trail warning signs indicating trail crossing on eastbound Soledad Canyon Road, for right turns.
- Install signs on trail warning trail users to watch for turning motor vehicles.
- Work with Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department to conduct spot enforcement at these intersections.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources
Total estimated cost: $10,000 per intersection
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvements: Golden Oak Road and Soledad Canyon Road

Project Description
At the intersection of Golden Oak Road and Soledad Canyon Road, the Soledad Canyon Road Bike Path crosses from the north side to the south side of Soledad Canyon Road. The north leg of the four-way signalized intersection is an entrance into a shopping center. The shopping center entrance currently has two entry lanes and three exit lanes (two right turn lanes and one through and left turn lane). Pedestrians are restricted from crossing the west leg of the intersection. Bus stops are located on Soledad Canyon Road in each direction, on the far side of the intersection. Santa Clarita Lanes Bowling Alley is located in the shopping plaza north of Soledad. The railroad tracks parallel the trail north of Soledad.

Improvements Summary

Issues:
▲ Current crossing configuration is confusing to trail users.
▲ Potential conflicts between trail users and turning vehicles.
▲ Trail continuation on north side of Soledad is not clear from intersection.

Improvement Options:
▲ Install high-visibility crosswalks.
▲ Narrow entrance to Santa Clarita Lanes.
▲ Install directional signage for trail users at intersection.
▲ Develop landscaping in front of Santa Clarita Lanes to provide visual indication that trail continues.
▲ Create pavement treatment on sidewalk in front of Santa Clarita Lanes to delineate trail from sidewalk.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources
Total estimated cost: $51,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Intersection Improvement: High Visibility Crosswalk Installation

**Project Description**

In order to enhance pedestrian conditions at the city’s major arterial-arterial intersections, it is recommended that high visibility crosswalks and advance stop lines be installed at all locations. There are approximately 30 arterial-arterial intersections in Santa Clarita. Highest priority locations would be those with free right turn lanes, where striping high-visibility ladder crosswalk striping across the free right lanes would serve to enhance pedestrian visibility. Stop bars set back of the crosswalk on the through lanes would help to discourage encroachment of vehicles into the crosswalk area.

**Improvements Summary**

**Issues:**
- Free right turn lanes at many arterial intersections.
- Vehicles encroach into crosswalk area when waiting at traffic signals.

**Improvement Options:**
- Install high visibility crosswalk marking across all legs of arterial-arterial intersections. Highest priority locations are those with free right turn lanes.
- Install advance stop bars a minimum of 4 feet back from crosswalks at all non-yielding traffic lanes.

**Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources**

Total estimated cost: $300,000
Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
Sidewalk Gap Closure: Industrial Center

Project Description

Sidewalks are not present on most roadways within the Industrial Center. This project recommends developing a program to install connecting sidewalks within the Industrial Center. The project will include construction of ADA-accessible curb ramps, driveway reconstruction, tree removal and replanting, landscaping and irrigation, signal modification, and relocation of fire hydrants, traffic signs, and dry utility and water structures. Sidewalk installation will most likely be phased in over several years, with priority given to sidewalks that connect to the existing network outside the Industrial Center and sidewalks that provide access to bus stops. When possible, sidewalks should be provided on both sides of the street. Some sidewalk installation may require right-of-way acquisition or easements, though most should be able to be completed within City right-of-way. Roadway segments proposed for sidewalk installation are:

- Avenue Stanford from Newhall Ranch Road to Rye Canyon Road (transit route);
- Rye Canyon Road from Interstate 5 Overpass to Newhall Ranch Road (transit route);
- Avenue Scott from Rye Canyon Road to bridge over San Francisquito Creek (transit route);
- Avenue Tibbitts from Avenue Scott to Newhall Ranch Road (transit route);
- Anza Drive from Avenue Scott to the south end (priority connection).

Improvements Summary

Issues:
- Most roadways in Industrial Center lack sidewalks.
- Bus stops are not accessible via sidewalks.

Improvement Options:
- Prioritize roadways for sidewalk installation based on connectivity to existing sidewalk network, and access to bus stops.
- Phase sidewalk construction over several years.
- Tie sidewalk construction to development within the Industrial Center.
- Use sidewalk design guidelines presented in this document to ensure sidewalks are buffered from vehicle traffic and ADA-compliant.

Cost Estimate and Potential Funding Sources

Total estimated cost:
- Phase 1, Avenue Scott: $2.0 million
- Phase 2, Rye Canyon: $1.4 million
- Phase 3, Avenue Stanford: $1.1 million
- Phase 4, Anza Drive and Avenue Tibbitts: $1.8 million

Cost estimates are preliminary and subject to change upon further field review.
6. Strategies to Promote Biking and Walking

This chapter provides policy, planning and program strategies that serve to encourage biking and walking as an everyday means of transportation in Santa Clarita. The chapter consists of the following key sections:

6.1 Design Recommendations presents design recommendations for bicycle and pedestrian facilities that address the City's unique needs. These recommendations supplement the design guidelines provided in Appendices C through D. (Page 6-Error! Bookmark not defined.)

6.2. Recommended Policy Modifications provides recommendations for modifying the City's adopted policies to better reflect the needs of non-motorized users. (Page 6-4)

6.3. Transit Recommendations describes best practices that City of Santa Transit can use to integrate transit, biking and walking. (Page 6-5)

6.4. Travel Demand Management introduces the concept of Travel Demand Management (TDM), describes how the City is currently practicing TDM and lists specific TDM strategies for City of Santa Clarita's consideration. (Page 6-6)

6.5. Land Use Policies to Promote Biking and Walking offers solutions for increasing bicycle and pedestrian trips through the implementation of land use regulations and policies that encourage pedestrian and bicycle friendly development. (Page 6-15)

6.1. Design Recommendations

Well-designed bicycle and pedestrian facilities are vital to encouraging biking and walking. Basic design guidelines are determined by Caltrans' Highway Design Manual and the Federal Americans with Disabilities Act guidelines. This section highlights specific design recommendations that will address the unique needs of Santa Clarita's non-motorized users. The recommendations presented here are intended to supplement the design guidelines presented in Appendices C through D and the requirements presented in the Highway Design Manual and Federal ADA guidelines.

6.1.1. Class I Bike Path

Santa Clarita's bike paths include those completely away from roadways (e.g. the South Fork Trail) and those that run parallel to adjacent roadways (e.g. Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail-Trail along Soledad Canyon Road.) Santa Clarita's bicycle paths are heavily used by pedestrians and cyclists, requiring special attention to designs that minimize user conflicts. Bicycle paths adjacent to parallel streets are not appropriate in all situations, particularly where there are numerous cross-streets or driveways. Parallel paths also only serve only one side of the roadway, reducing their functionality on roadways with destinations on both sides of the road. In cases where numerous crossings exist or
destinations are along both sides of the road, and on-street bicycle facility, such as wide Class II bike lanes, may be more appropriate.

Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000 generally discourages bike paths immediately adjacent to roadways:

“Bike paths immediately adjacent to streets and highways are not recommended. They should not be considered a substitute for the street, because many bicyclists will find it less convenient to ride on these types of facilities as compared with the streets, particularly for utility trips.” (1003.1 (5))

Where it has been determined that a parallel bicycle path is the most appropriate facility, special design considerations are needed that minimize conflicts between crossing motor vehicle traffic and path users and between different user groups on the path.

**Recommendations**
To enhance the enjoyment and safety of Santa Clarita’s bicycle paths, it is recommended that the city:

- Ensure that all newly constructed bike paths meet or exceed design standards outlined in Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000. Where feasible, make every effort to retrofit existing bicycle paths to meet or exceed design standards outlined in Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 1000.
- Construct, wherever feasible, separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Design combined pedestrian-bicycle facilities to a minimum of 12’, with wider widths if feasible.
- Where width allows, on combined facilities install signage and pavement stencils designating separate areas on the path for bicycles and pedestrians to reduce conflicts between different user groups.
- On steep grades, construct bicycle paths to a higher design speed, with additional width provided to accommodate faster moving bicyclists traveling downhill.
- Design new trails with a minimum 2’ graded area adjacent to the path to provide clearance from trees, poles, walks, guardrails or other obstacles. Where feasible, retrofit existing trails to meet the 2’ clearance requirement.
- Minimize planned driveways and roadway crossings of existing and proposed bicycle path alignments.
- Design crossings with driveways and roadways to ensure the safety and convenience of non-motorized trail users, including but not limited to, constructing perpendicular curb ramps with truncated domes on the ramp surface, installing bicycle-accessible push buttons, warning signs indicating to watch for bicyclists, and high-visibility crosswalk treatments.
- Re-evaluate the use of “Stop Walk Bike” signage on bike path intersections with driveways and roadways. Consider establishing high-visibility multi-use trail crossing markings and signage that permit bicyclists to ride through the crossing after stopping at the intersection.
- At signalized intersections that serve bicycle paths, consider modifying the pedestrian walk signal so that it is automatic instead of actuated, if traffic conditions allow.
6. Strategies to Promote Biking and Walking

- Provide a minimum 5’ separation between bicycle paths and adjacent parallel roadways, with a wider separation if feasible. At locations without a 5’ separation, provide a physical barrier at least 42” high, with 2’ clearance from the roadway.

6.1.2. Class II Bike Lane

Often referred to as a “bike lane,” a Class II bikeway provides a striped and stenciled lane for one-way travel on either side of a street or highway. Many of Santa Clarita’s major roadways are multi-lane with posted speed limits of 45 mph. Most signalized intersections include free right turn lanes. Wider bicycle lanes are recommended on Santa Clarita’s major roadways to provide additional separation between bicyclists and motor vehicles. To provide bike lanes along corridors where insufficient space is currently available, extra room can be provided by removing a traffic lane, narrowing traffic lanes, or narrowing the median.

Recommendations
- Ensure that newly constructed bicycle lanes meet or exceed design standards outlined in Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 100. Where feasible, make every effort to retrofit existing bicycle lanes to meet or exceed design standards outlined in Caltrans highway Design Manual Chapter 100.
- Where feasible, provide 6’ wide bicycle lanes, as measured from the curb face, 4’ measured from the gutter pan seam.
- Where feasible, provide bicycle pockets to the left of single right turn lanes along roadways that are striped with bicycle lanes.
- Calibrate signal detection devices (loop detectors, video detection) to actuate a signal if a bicycle is present.

6.1.3. Class III Bike Route

Generally referred to as a “bike route,” a Class III bikeway provides routes through areas not served by Class I or II facilities and is used to connect discontinuous segments of a bikeway. Class III facilities are identified only by signing. However, when encouraging bicyclists to travel along selected routes, traffic speed and volume, parking, traffic control devices, and surface quality should be acceptable for bicycle travel. A wide outside traffic lane (at least 14’) is preferable to enable cars to pass bicyclists safely without crossing the centerline.

Recommendations
- Ensure that newly designated bike routes meet or exceed design standards outlined in Caltrans Highway Design Manual Chapter 100. Where feasible, make every effort to improve existing bike routes to meet or exceed design standards outlined in Caltrans highway Design Manual Chapter 100.
- Whenever possible, especially on multi-lane roadways, provide a minimum 15’ outside lane on designated bicycle routes.
- On roadways designated as bike routes, ensure that traffic speed and volume, parking, traffic control devices and surface quality are acceptable for bicycle travel.
- Consider traffic calming devices to reduce or slow traffic on minor roadways designated as bicycle routes.
• Consider where appropriate (e.g. on streets with parallel parking), installation of shared lane markings.

6.1.4. Sidewalks
The sidewalk should be viewed as one component of the larger sidewalk corridor. Sidewalk corridors should contain zones dedicated to different uses, such as walking, furnishings, utilities (lighting), landscaping and so forth. Sidewalk corridors that include pedestrian-scale amenities are attractive and encourage walking. It is recommended that the area dedicated to walking be a minimum of 5 feet wide with 6 feet or more of area provided when possible. It is recommended that a buffer of at least 2 feet should be provided between the edge of the sidewalk and the adjacent roadway, except where there is insufficient right-of-way. This buffer should be landscaped and should be at least five feet wide where possible.

6.1.5. Paseos
Santa Clarita’s paseo network serves residential neighborhoods of Valencia. The paseo network provides pedestrian and bicycle connectivity that is separate from the roadways, and provides more direct routes than traveling on the roadway. Paseos should be designed to provide pedestrian and bicycle access between cul-de-sacs and from the neighborhood to adjacent commercial and retail centers, between adjacent neighborhoods, and between residential areas and trails, sidewalks, roadways and transit stops. A wayfinding system, such as street identification and destination signs should be provided to allow residents and visitors to navigate the network. Paseos should be well lit, well maintained, and have attractive landscaping.

6.2. Recommended Policy Modifications
The Santa Clarita Municipal Code and Circulation Element of the General Plan include sections that are relevant to non-motorized transportation, including policies for constructing bikeways, a bicycle parking ordinance, and street and sidewalk design guidelines. These sections are summarized in Chapter 3, Planning and Policy Context. Please see Table 6-1 below. This Plan recommends that the City review the relevant sections of the Municipal Code and Circulation Element and consider adopting the following general changes, which are designed to enhance the safety and enjoyment of Santa Clarita’s non-motorized transportation system.
Table 6-1: Recommended Policy Modifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Design and Siting</td>
<td>Consider modifying the bicycle parking ordinance (UDC §17.18.105) to include bike rack design specifications and detailed siting criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Parking Parking Substitution</td>
<td>Consider allowing some property owners to substitute bicycle parking for motor vehicle parking. For example, the City of Santa Cruz allows new and pre-existing developments to convert up to 10% of their automobile spaces to non-required additional bicycle parking if the spaces are located near an entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Design Guidelines</td>
<td>Consider modifying language in the Circulation Element Street Design Guidelines to clarify appropriate locations for parallel Class I facilities versus Class II facilities. Remove broad language stating that “Class I Paths are preferred over Class II Bike Lanes” and replace with more specific criteria indicating when parallel Class I bicycle paths may be appropriate (high speed/volume roadways with minimal crossings) and when Class II Bicycle Lanes may be more appropriate (numerous crossings, destinations on both sides) and stating that the appropriate facility should be decided on a case-by-case basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosswalk Installation</td>
<td>Municipal Code §12.52.020 allows for crosswalks to be installed at intersections if “such markings will improve traffic conditions.” Consider revising to allow crosswalks “if such markings will improve traffic conditions and safety.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing Restrictions</td>
<td>Municipal Code §12.52.030 allows for bicyclists and pedestrians to be prohibited from crossing at certain locations if it would cause “traffic complications”. The City should consider revising this section to reflect that bicyclists riding in the roadway are considered vehicles by California Vehicle Code, and may not be restricted from crossing movements that other vehicles are allowed. Bicyclists walking their bicycles in crosswalks are considered pedestrians, and may be restricted from crossing movements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. Transit Recommendations

Public transit and bicycle and pedestrian facilities complement each other. Transit increases the length and variety of possible bicycle and pedestrian trips, making it possible for people to choose biking and walking as their transportation mode more frequently. In turn, transit users access stations and stops by bicycle and on foot, so there is great need for good bicycle and pedestrian design at these locations.

The following recommendations for developing bicycle and pedestrian friendly transit are based on recommendations found in Santa Clarita’s Transportation Development Plan. Some recommendations provided below may require Santa Clarita to modify its Unified Development Code, and may be difficult to implement in already established developments. Newer developments, however, and developments governed by the Mixed Use Overlay Zone, may be able to take advantage of most of these recommendations. Specific recommendations for improving transit access are provided in Table 6-2.
Table 6-2:
Recommendations to Improve Biking and Walking Access to Transit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Area</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>Develop coordinated plans for land use, circulation and transit with City and County departments to concentrate high density housing, employment and commercial areas close to transit corridors. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend amending the City’s General Plan to designate larger areas near the Town Center and near rail stations for high and moderate density residential use. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with City and County departments to require rights of way in new development for walking, bicycling, and access to transit. This includes through public streets, sidewalks, bicycle paths, design of intersections for easy pedestrian crossings, and linkages between paseos and arterial streets. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks and Paseos</td>
<td>Provide sidewalks, of sufficient width, on all streets leading to bus stop and assure that sidewalks are wide enough and clear enough for bus stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Design sidewalks so they are safe and visually appealing. Provide adequate lighting and clear sight lines on sidewalks and pathways, make sidewalks and paths visually interesting and active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Install sidewalks in commercial areas and along major arterial streets (to the extent extra right-of-way is available).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retrofit older paseo crossings to provide reasonable access to arterial bus routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide reasonably direct and readily visible pedestrian access between paseos and bus routes in new developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide improved paseo signage to direct people to transit stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construct paved waiting pads in safe, logical positions where paseos intersect with arterial bus routes. Ensure that the bus waiting pad is ADA accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Access</td>
<td>Retrofit pedestrian access to arterials where cul-de-sacs “stub up” or run along boundary walls, provided there is neighborhood support. Ensure that new developments build pedestrian access points to arterials at every reasonable opportunity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide pedestrian access across flood control channels and utility barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve crossing opportunities across major arterials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Lots</td>
<td>Provide clear, direct pedestrian paths separated from parking between transit stops and shopping center entrances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage new development to place shop buildings closer to the street and street corners to reduce the distance pedestrians must walk to access transit stops. Place auto parking at the side and back of buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.4. Travel Demand Management

Travel Demand Management (TDM) can be defined as “strategies that result in more efficient use of transportation resources.”4 This view recognizes that people travel not as an end in itself, but rather as a means to an end. People travel to work, to socialize, to run errands, to attend medical appointments and to access recreational facilities. TDM strategies seek to make it easier for people to get where they are going either by moving them more efficiently or by designing land uses so that they do not need to travel very far to access the destinations they want to reach.

Travel Demand Management includes policies to reduce congestion, such as alternative work schedules, polices to induce a shift from single-occupancy vehicles to higher occupancy vehicles, such as ride matching programs, and

---

1 Goal 5, Objective A from Transportation Development Plan.
2 Goal 5, Objective C from Transportation Development Plan.
3 Goal 5, Objective D from Transportation Development Plan.
4 Victoria Transport Institute, Online TDM Encyclopedia, http://www.vtpi.org/tdm/, June 2006. Many of the policies outlined in this document are discussed in further detail on their website.
policies to shift trips from driving to biking, walking or transit, such as parking fee programs. TDM also encompasses long-term strategies to reduce the need to travel in the first place. These include land use patterns that mix and cluster residential, office, commercial and recreational uses, development of a comprehensive bicycle and pedestrian network, and incentives for developers to build less auto-oriented developments, and incentives to assist homeowners who purchase homes that are close to transit, retail and other amenities.

Most Travel Demand Management sees vehicle-related travel problems as caused by market distortions that price driving much lower than it should be compared to alternative modes. Though drivers pay for gas, insurance, the vehicle, and in some cases parking, many of the costs that driving imposes—air, noise, water pollution, congestion, and land dedicated to parking—are not borne directly by the driver but are borne by society. Strategies that include these externalities in the cost of driving and strategies that make alternative modes more attractive than driving can alleviate this market distortion, reduce the total amount of driving, and reduce overall congestion.

This section outlines Santa Clarita’s existing Travel Demand Management strategies and makes recommendations for additional TDM strategies the City may want to consider.

Recommendations have been selected based on their applicability to the City of Santa Clarita and their ability to meet the City’s goal of trip reduction. However, some policies may be logistically challenging to implement, and may require significant changes to Santa Clarita’s current development standards.

6.4.1. TDM and Non-Motorized Transportation Planner

Transportation Demand Management strategies are complementary, and work best if implemented consistently on a district or citywide scale. Local implementation may not yield the same benefits in trip reduction.

Recommendations

To support city-wide implementation, it is recommended that the City encourage the development of an entity to design, implement and enforce a citywide TDM program.

Consider establishing a TDM and non-motorized transportation planner position. This position could oversee the development of a Transportation Demand Management program, oversee the development of the bikeway, trails, paseo and sidewalk network, evaluate developer proposals, work with City of Santa Clarita Transit and Metrolink to ensure the accessibility of transit, coordinate safe routes to schools programs and coordinate citywide education, encouragement and incentive programs to promote biking and walking.

6.4.2. District and Regional Coordination

Transportation Demand Management strategies are most effective if they are coordinated at the district or regional level. Santa Clarita may consider coordinating Transportation Demand Management by neighborhood, citywide or Valley-wide. Coordination is typically overseen by a TDM program within a City government, by an independent government agency, or by a public-private partnership.

A TDM Program serves to ensure that all land use and transportation policies are consistent in meeting the TDM goals. A program may coordinate planning, evaluation and data collection, market the TDM program and respond to
concerns, provide ride matching and alternative transportation promotion, provide parking brokerage services, and provide special event transportation services.

In Los Angeles County, information about many of these services is provided by Metro and is accessible at www.CommuteSmart.info. The website provides numerous resources for cities and employers to use to promote and implement ridesharing, alternative commute incentives and support programs. The website also contains a regional ride matching service for all of Southern California and rewards and gift certificates for employees who rideshare, take transit, walk or bicycle.

**Recommendation**
Utilize and promote the regional commuter resources provided by Metro on the CommuteSmart.info website.

6.4.3. Commute Trip Reduction Program

Commute Trip Reduction Programs are a combination of TDM strategies that employers implement to encourage employees to use alternatives to the single-occupancy vehicle for some or all of their commute trips. Trip Reduction Programs include incentives for employees to carpool, take transit, bicycle or walk. A comprehensive Trip Reduction Program can reduce trips at worksites by 5 to 20%.5

**Recommendations**
Encourage the City’s largest employers to develop Trip Reduction Programs that incorporate the following policies, as recommended by the Environmental Protection Agency:

- A guaranteed ride home.
- At least $30 per employee per month in transit vouchers, or the full cost of transit for employees who take transit.
- At least $30 per employee per month in vanpool vouchers, or the full cost of travel, for employees who use a vanpool.
- A telecommute policy that reduces trips by 6% or greater.
- At least $30 per month, in lieu of free or subsidized parking, for employees who choose to leave their cars at home.

6.4.4. Ridesharing

Ridesharing includes carpooling and vanpooling. Most ridesharing programs consist of ride matching services (online, bulletin boards) and supporting policies such as preferential parking, marketing and vouchers. The City of Santa Clarita’s Transportation Development Plan supports ridesharing and recommends that the city consider

---

5 Comsis Corporation, *Implementing Effective Travel Demand Management Measures: Inventory of Measures and Synthesis of Experience*, USDOT (http://ntl.bts.gov/DOCS/474.html) and Institute of Transportation Engineers (www.ite.org), 1993.
subsidizing vanpools and experimenting with new multi-occupant services such as shared-ride taxis, vanpools and bus pools.

**Recommendations**
Promote Los Angeles County's existing ridesharing service and/or develop a City-sponsored ridesharing program in combination with local businesses, and neighboring communities. The City of Santa Clarita should take advantage of the ridesharing services provided by the regional website CommuteSmart.info. This website provides ride-matching services for employees, transit trip planners, traffic information, guaranteed ride home information, and information on bicycling to work.

**6.4.5. Alternative Work Schedules**
Alternative work schedules reduce the number of commuters that are on the road during peak travel times. Alternative work schedules include flex hours, in which employees may stagger their work hours, compressed work weeks, in which employees work fewer days but longer hours, and staggered shifts, in which the start of each shift is staggered. Flextime and staggered shifts reduces peak hour congestion by shifting some trips off peak hours. Compressed workweeks reduce total vehicle travel by reducing the number of days employees go to work.

The City of Santa Clarita currently uses a 9/80 compressed work week. City employees work 9 hours a day, with alternate Fridays off. The work Friday is an eight hour day.

**Recommendations**
Continue a compressed work week schedule for City employees

Encourage Santa Clarita’s major employers to adopt Alternative Work Schedules such as flex hours, compressed work weeks or staggered shifts, as appropriate.

**6.4.6. Guaranteed Ride Home**
Guaranteed Ride Home programs complement TDM programs that promote biking, walking, ridesharing and public transit. Through the program, employees who use an alternative mode to get to work may use the program to get home in an emergency or if they must stay at work late.

In Los Angeles County, CommuteSmart.info provides information about a guaranteed ride home service for employees who commute to work by bicycle, walking or transit. The program provides employees of participating firms a free taxi ride home (up to 75 miles) in the event of an emergency at home, illness, unexpected overtime, or if a vanshare or carpool driver has to leave early.

**Recommendations**
Consider participating in the regional guaranteed ride home program and develop and promote a guaranteed ride home policy for City employees.
Determine the feasibility of providing guaranteed ride home services through City of Santa Transit's on-demand shuttle service.

Encourage employers to complement existing TDM programs with a guaranteed ride home program.

6.4.7. Telecommuting
Telecommuting refers to working from home while connected to work via the internet, phone and fax. Telecommuting can significantly reduce peak hour congestion, but may not reduce overall trips, since telecommuters may make additional trips to run errands that would otherwise be done as part of the commute trip, other family members can use the telecommuter's car, or employees may move farther from their worksite.

Recommendations
Consider adopting a telecommuting policy and support programs for its employees.

Using regional resources available on CommuteSmart.info provide information to employers that wish to establish telecommuting policies.

6.4.8. Shuttle Buses
Shuttle bus service can reduce the number of trips a driver makes (e.g. replacing a lunchtime drive to the mall to eat) or can replace driving entirely (e.g. providing a service to a transit station). Shuttles can also encourage employees to use alternative modes of transportation for the commute by ensuring that they will be able to get lunch or run errands on their lunch break without the need for a vehicle.

The City of Santa Clarita’s TDP recommends “Working with Santa Clarita employers to develop shuttle services to workplaces from Metrolink and/or transit centers”

Recommendation
Work with Santa Clarita employers to develop shuttle services to workplaces from Metrolink and/or transit centers.

6.4.9. Commuter Financial Incentives
Employers can provide numerous financial incentives to encourage employees to commute by alternative modes. Two incentives are described below. Employers who provide these transportation fringe benefits may be eligible for tax breaks under the “Commuter Choice” program in the federal tax code.

Parking Cash Out
Employers may provide up to $200 in parking cash-outs per employee per month as pre-tax commuter benefits. Employees who drive still receive subsidies in the form of free parking while those who choose another mode receive

---

7 See http://www.commutesmart.info/employerservices/commuterchoice.asp for more information.
the equivalent in cash. Parking cash out has been shown to reduce trips by 17% at suburban and urban worksites in California.\(^8\)

**Transit Benefits**

The national Commuter Check program allows employers to provide up to $105 per employee per month in pre-tax transit vouchers. A study of 1,110 Los Angeles commute trip reduction programs found that financial incentives were the most effective in reducing drive alone mode share. The implementation transit subsidies in the Los Angeles area resulted in a reduction of drive alone mode share by 3.1%.\(^9\) In the City of Santa Clarita, employees may use their city identification badge to ride City of Santa Clarita Transit for free.

**Recommendation**

If feasible, establish a parking cash-out policy for City employees who choose not to drive to work.

Provide Commuter Checks to employees who take transit other than City of Santa Clarita Transit.

Using regional resources, promote parking cash-out and transit voucher policies to local employers.

**6.4.10. Parking Management**

Parking management refers to strategies that encourage efficient use of parking spaces, and as a result, more efficient travel. A district or city-wide parking management strategy, including, in some instances, provisions to allow businesses to share parking, parking pricing, and unbundling parking from building rents, can reduce automobile trips by 10-30%. Santa Clarita is best poised to take advantage of the following parking management strategies:

- **Shared parking** allows motorists or businesses to share parking spaces. Shared parking works best with employees that have differing peak hours. For example, a restaurant and a business park may share parking. This type of shared parking can reduce the total amount of parking by 40-60%.\(^10\)

- The price of parking is often included in the price of leasing, renting or buying a building. In Santa Clarita, building owners are required to own or lease (for a term of at least 20 years) the parking spaces required for their premises. (§17.18.04 A) The cost of owning or leasing this parking is then passed on to building tenants. **Unbundling parking** from the cost of the unit and selling or renting it separately allows tenants to purchase or lease only the required number of parking spaces.

- **Priced parking** can be used to reduce parking problems in a particular area, to reduce vehicle traffic in a particular area, to recover the costs of building a parking facility, or to generate revenue for non-parking related purposes. Pricing commuter parking and higher pricing during peak hours is effective in reducing peak use.

- **Regulated parking** can encourage more efficient use. Generally, this strategy relies on reserving nearby parking for high-value users. Examples of regulation include reserving spaces for disabled persons.

---


(required by federal law), ridesharing vehicles or encouraging employees to use less convenient parking spaces allowing customers to use more proximate spaces.

- **Public parking** can be relied upon to meet parking needs for multiple sites. It has been estimated that 100 public parking spaces can serve 150-250 private parking spaces. Santa Clarita is not currently developed to take advantage of this strategy, since most parking is provided by private off-street lots and street standards prohibit or restrict on-street parking. However, some newer specific plans, most notably the Downtown Newhall Specific Plan, allow for on-street parking and public lots.

The City of Santa Clarita already has some policies that reflect parking management “best practices”:

The City’s Unified Development Code allows developments in commercial and industrial zones to apply for a conditional use permit to share more than 20% of parking (§17.18.140 C). Shared parking is allowed if business operations are not conducted during the same hours, and if a parking analysis shows that there will not be substantial conflict during peak periods of operation. Additionally, the Unified Development Code allows public and private park developments to apply for a reduction in parking without a public hearing if the Director of Parks and Recreation determines the need for parking to be less than the standard requirements, that the reduced parking will not result in increased congestion or excess off-site parking, that no written protest has been received and that sufficient land area has been reserved to provide additional parking in the future, if needed (§17.18.130 A).

The Santa Clarita TDP supports parking management strategies and recommends that the city “permit a higher floor area ratio and lower parking requirements for commercial developments that provide transit facilities and subsidize shared-ride programs.” And “Work with the City and County to establish maximum parking limits for major development that is located on routes with frequent transit service.”

The City of Santa Clarita currently requires parking provisions for loading and unloading zones and for disabled persons. (§17.18.120 and §17.18.080, respectively).

**Recommendations**

Consider developing specific shared parking policy for land uses in addition to commercial and industrial zoned areas. For example, mixed use districts, Community Commercial and Business Park zoning designations may be able to take advantage of shared parking without adversely affecting on-street vehicle flow or spilling over into adjacent parking.

Research the feasibility of unbundling parking costs from building rents and leases, in conjunction with a shared parking policy and development-based parking brokerage system.

Consider establishing public parking lots and on-street metered parking, as appropriate, in employment, commercial and retail areas with high parking demand. Community support is more likely if parking fees are implemented at appropriate locations, and if some or the entire fee is used to fund local public improvements. A parking pricing strategy should be accompanied by an outreach effort that describes alternative ways of getting to the destination and describes how local businesses and residents will benefit from the parking fees.

---

Consider reserving preferential parking spaces at city-owned buildings for carpool, vanpool and other ridesharing vehicles. Encourage employers to provide reserved parking spaces.

6.4.11. Car-Free Planning

Car-free planning refers to creating specific areas to minimize vehicle use. Examples include pedestrian-oriented commercial streets where driving is limited or prohibited and mixed-use downtown or residential neighborhoods where personal automobiles are unnecessary and automobile traffic is restricted.

The City of Santa Clarita has the opportunity to establish Car-Free sections through its Mixed-Use Overlay Zone and Special Plan Districts.

**Recommendations**

Work with residents and developers to use the Mixed-Use Overlay Zone and Special Plan Districts to establish pedestrian-oriented communities, which provide all basic amenities within walking or biking distance and which limit personal automobile traffic.

Develop a “Best Practices” pamphlet to distribute to developers who are interested in developing pedestrian-oriented communities.

6.4.12. Transportation Management Association

Another method of coordinating TDM strategies is through a Transportation Management Association (TMA). TMAs are private, non-profit, member-controlled organizations that provide and coordinate transportation services in a smaller area, such as a business park or a commercial district. They are typically formed by neighboring businesses, and allow smaller employers to provide Commute Trip Reduction strategies similar to those offered by larger employers. TMAs are appropriate where multiple businesses are located close to each other. TMAs can be funded by public dollars, revenues from parking meters or commission from selling transit passes.

**Recommendation**

Work with business parks, retail centers, industrial and commercial areas to support existing Transportation Management Associations and provide assistance in developing new TMAs.

6.4.13. Evaluating TDM Strategies

It is important to measure the effectiveness of TDM strategies. Traditional transportation evaluation measurements, which rely on vehicle-based data, may not take into account the experience of the individual consumer of the transportation system. For example, though streets in high-density areas may have lower LOS service levels, residents of these areas may have reduced overall travel times because they have closer destinations and more travel options. The City should consider alternative measurements that include factors in addition to Level of Service or delay per vehicle to measure the effectiveness of TDM strategies.

**Table 6-3** represents the overall impacts and benefits of TDM programs presented above. The travel impact score reflects how well the program reduces daily and peak-period traffic. This includes shifting traffic to off-peak commute times and to alternative modes of transportation such as public transit, bicycling, walking, as well as
increases ridesharing and telecommuting. The overall benefit score includes larger, societal objectives such as reducing congestion, passing on savings to roads, parking, and consumers, increasing transportation choices, improving safety and creating more livable communities. As Table 6-3 shows, the Transportation Demand Management strategies with the greatest impacts and societal benefits are financial incentives, trip reduction programs and parking management.

### Table 6-3:
**Effectiveness of Selected Travel Demand Management Strategies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Travel Impact</th>
<th>Overall Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Financial Incentives</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute Trip Reduction Program</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Management (including Unbundling Parking)</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shuttle Buses</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Ride Home</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pricing</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car-Free Planning*</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridesharing</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommuting</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Work Schedules</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Parking**</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

○ = Low, ● = Medium-Low, ○ = Medium-High, ● = High
*in a large area
** Depends on parking cost and land use impacts

### 6.4.14. Funding Transportation Demand Management Strategies

Transportation Demand Management strategies can be funded from a variety of sources. In some cases, such as parking fees, the strategies are self-funding. Some funding mechanisms include:

- **Price parking.** Parking revenues can be used to fund other TDM strategies, or to provide improvements to a business district that has agreed to price parking.

- **Transportation impact fees.** Developers may be required to pay for the transportation costs imposed by their projects. Fees can be used for public parking facilities, roadway improvements, trails, and sidewalks.\(^{12}\)

- **Special property taxes.** Neighborhoods or jurisdictions may agree to special property taxes that pay for non-motorized transportation improvements and services.

- **Vehicle impact mitigation fees.** This is a per-vehicle registration fee that can be used to pay for non-motorized transportation facilities and TDM projects.

\(^{12}\) The City currently collects Bridge and Thoroughfare fees and Transit Impact fees from developers to pay for transportation infrastructure and transit improvements.
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- **Business or employee assessments.** Special assessments on businesses can be used to pay for Transportation Management Associations or Commute Trip Reduction programs. Fees can be based on floor area, revenues or number of employees.

6.5. **Land Use Policies to Promote Biking and Walking**

The provision of safe sidewalks and bicycle facilities alone may not be sufficient to increase non-motorized transportation mode share. Land use patterns and policies, which encourage the accommodation of bicyclists and pedestrians, are also important. People are motivated to walk and bicycle for transportation when their destinations are close by, routes of travel are interesting, safe and comfortable, and a mix of uses allows for the combination of trips for maximum convenience. This section offers solutions for increasing bicycle and pedestrian trips through the implementation of land use regulations and policies, which encourage pedestrian and bicycle friendly development.

Santa Clarita has a varied mix of development patterns; some encourage biking and walking, and some present challenges to these modes. It can be difficult to retrofit existing development and change existing land uses to better support non-motorized transportation modes. To better accommodate all transportation modes in Santa Clarita, the following strategies should be emphasized in new developments, and in selected existing neighborhood centers.

6.5.1. **Clustered Development**

The City of Santa Clarita’s General Plan currently encourages clustered development. Specifically, the General Plan encourages the identification of “a primary town center and other centers which encourage pedestrian orientation and can accommodate a clustered mix of commercial, entertainment, recreation, town square/meeting place(s), multi-use complexes, and multimodal transportation activity opportunities.”

Clustering higher density development in activity nodes creates a land use pattern, which supports transit and non-motorized transportation because it allows infrastructure to be tied to land use development. Infrastructure such as transit facilities, and on-street or off-street bicycle facilities can serve a high number of users traveling between or along clusters of higher-density development. Clustering development into areas served by transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities encourages people to use these modes and serves a larger number of users.

**Recommendation**

Continue to support clustered development in future development projects. Focus such development at key transit stops and corridors, and provide pedestrian and bicycle connections from clustered development to existing transit stops, bikeways and trails.

6.5.2. **Mix of Uses**

Santa Clarita’s Municipal Code currently includes a mixed-use overlay zone designation, discussed in the previous chapter. Within the overlay zone, pedestrian-centered mixed-use development is encouraged. Santa Clarita is also proposing a form-based (rather than use-based) zoning code for its Downtown Newhall Specific Plan. This type of zoning ordinance can be effective in encouraging pedestrian-friendly urban design in an area without requiring a specific type of use.

---

13 City of Santa Clarita General Plan Land Use Element, Policy 3.3
Encouraging new developments to mix land use types to include housing, office and commercial uses can greatly increase the number of people who choose to walk or bicycle. People tend to walk to destinations within a one-quarter mile area and bicycle to destinations within a half-mile. Traditional zoning segregates land uses based on their type, creating much longer distances between trips and encouraging people to drive instead. Land use mixing can be horizontal, with different types of uses located in very close proximity, or vertical, with more than one use in the same building. An example of vertical mixing is ground floor retail with office or residential on the floors above.

**Recommendation**
Continue to work with developers and residents to create new mixed-use overlay zones within the City. Promote such zones at locations that are well-served by transit, and non-motorized connections such as bikeways, paseos, sidewalks and trails.

6.5.3. Connectivity

In new residential developments, creating a continuous network of streets is important to increase the convenience of walking or bicycling. Cul-de-sacs and street closures create barriers to people who wish to make trips by foot or bicycle.

**Recommendation**
Ensure a pedestrian and bicycle connectivity by permitting cul-de-sacs only where there is no feasible connection with an adjacent street.

Require developers to improve and dedicate to the public accessways that connect to cul-de-sac streets, to pass through oddly shaped or unusually long blocks, to provide for networks or public paths creating access to schools, parks, shopping centers, mass transportation stops or other community services.14

6.5.4. Transit-Oriented Development

The City of Santa Clarita has encouraged the development of transit-oriented development at the Jan Heidt Newhall Metrolink Station. Transit-oriented development concentrates high-density, mixed-use development near transit stations in order to encourage transit use. Some cities have established density “thresholds,” which specify the minimum allowable density of new development around transit stations. Other cities encourage, but do not require, higher density land uses near transit stations. Because every transit rider is a pedestrian at some point during a trip, pedestrian access is essential to support transit-oriented development.

**Recommendations**
Continue to support mixed-use development at the City’s three Metrolink Stations, and consider expanding transit-oriented development to major bus corridors and transfer points.

Consider establishing a Transit-Oriented District Overlay Zone.

---

14 Adapted from “Making Better Communities: Linking Land Use and Transportation,” Association of Bay Area Governments.
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6.5.5. Development Review

Incorporating bicycle and pedestrian needs during development project review can ensure that all new development reflects the needs of non-motorized transportation users. Development review can be used to ensure that developers comply with non-motorized transportation requirements and recommendations, such as the City of Santa Clarita’s bicycle parking ordinance which requires bicycle parking in all new developments, and the Transportation Development Plan’s recommendation that pedestrian connections to transit stops be incorporated into new developments.15

**Recommendations**

Establish a consistent methodology for analyzing traffic impacts that evaluates the quality of the required or proposed transit, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Require that Level of Service evaluations consider the impacts on bicyclists and pedestrians.

Require incorporation of Transportation Demand Management measures as part of project approval for large developments.

Within large, single parcel, commercial developments require that developers provide an on-site circulation system that minimizes the conflicts between pedestrians, bicyclists and traffic at all points of pedestrian and bicycle access to on-site parking and building entrances.

6.5.6. Sidewalk Requirements

The City of Santa Clarita has several requirements for the provision of sidewalks and pedestrian walkways:

The City of Santa Clarita’s Unified Development Code requires the construction of midblock pedestrian ways in blocks longer than 700 feet (§16.11.130). This section of code provides the City with the ability to require the dedication of pedestrian pathways connecting long blocks to surrounding roadways. Providing pedestrians with shorter distances and more direct routes to destinations encourages walking.

Unified Development Code (§16.17.050) requires developers to consider the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit users when designing new subdivisions. In order to enforce this code section uniformly, developers may be required to submit a transit and non-motorized access plan with their development application.

Section 17.15.060 provides minimum specifications for sidewalks and reiterates that all road improvements shall comply with the City Standards. The code dictates a minimum of 4 feet in width for all sidewalks, unless the “available portion of the highway or street is less, in which case they shall be the width specified by the City Engineer.” The minimum standard of 4 feet meets the minimum requirements for the State of California. However, pedestrian safety and enjoyment while using sidewalk facilities is not only contingent on the width of sidewalks. Sidewalks should also provide separation and refuge from traffic, places to stop and rest, safe crossings, which connect to other pedestrian facilities and destinations, good visibility of oncoming traffic and wayfinding signage helping pedestrians navigate to their destinations, particularly to other transportation connections, such as transit stations.

---

15 City of Santa Clarita Unified Development Code, Section 17.03.050
Recommendations

New Development
Ensure that all new developments within the City meet or exceed the City’s requirements for sidewalk provision and non-motorized access.

Work with the County of Los Angeles to ensure that future developments within unincorporated areas of the county meet or exceed Santa Clarita’s requirements for sidewalk provision.

Consider adding to Section 16.17.050 of the Unified Development Code to provide more specific guidance on how developers must consider the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists and transit users. Specific guidance may include creating clear, direct and pleasant pedestrian and bicycle connections between internal street networks and nearby bus stops and arterials, providing internal wayfinding signage to nearby trails, bikeways and transit stops, developing, printing and distributing to residents and/or employees a biking and walking map that includes connections to the citywide bicycle and pedestrian network, and creating clear, direct and pleasant connections to surrounding paseo and sidewalk networks.

Retrofitting
Establish a policy requiring installation of sidewalks as a requirement of major modifications to existing developments.

Work with developers and the County of Los Angeles to retrofit sidewalks in areas that were developed before Santa Clarita’s incorporation.
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This chapter identifies steps towards implementation of the proposed facilities of this Plan, the estimated costs for the proposed facilities and maintenance, and strategies on funding and financing. Cost estimates provided in this chapter do not reflect costs of recommended programs and support facilities such as signage, kiosks and bike parking. Planning level cost estimates for this type of work are difficult to accurately estimate and need to be developed in context with a selected location.

This chapter includes the following sections:

7.1. Implementation Process provides general information about the steps needed to implement a project. (Page 7-1)

7.2. Project Prioritization explains the criteria used to prioritize projects. (Page 7-2)

7.3. Cost Breakdown presents cost estimates for individual recommended projects and maintenance. (Page 7-7)

7.4. Funding lists funding sources available for planning, designing and constructing recommended projects. (Page 7-13)

7.5. Implementation Strategies provides recommendations for implementing the projects identified in this Plan and outlines criteria that can be used to measure how effective the City’s efforts are at promoting the Plan’s vision. (Page 7-19)

7.1. Implementation Process

The City has a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) that provides funding for capital improvements including new bicycle and pedestrian facilities as well as rehabilitation of existing facilities. The CIP is valid for a period of five years. The CIP is updated every five years to address the deletion of projects that have been completed and the addition of new projects as well as changes to budgets designated for particular improvements. Bicycle and Pedestrian projects are usually funded by a combination of sources including funds from the City that is designated through the CIP process.

The steps required to implement the projects identified in this Plan will vary by project. Many signing and striping projects can be completed by the City of Santa Clarita Department of Public Works and are exempt from CEQA requirements. Such projects can be implemented using City or grant funds with project level review by the Planning Commission and City Council, if required due to the visibility or importance of the project. More complex projects with greater associated impacts typically include the following steps:
1. Preparation of a feasibility study involving a conceptual design (with consideration of possible alternatives and environmental issues) and cost estimate for individual projects as needed.

2. Secure, as necessary, outside funding and any applicable environmental approvals.

3. Approval of the project by the City Council.

4. Completion of final plans, specifications and estimates, advertising for bids, receipt of bids and award of contract(s).

5. Construction of project.

7.2. Project Prioritization

The intent of prioritizing projects is to identify which high-priority bicycle and pedestrian facilities will be constructed first. As projects are constructed, lower priority projects should be moved up the list. The project list and individual projects outlined in Santa Clarita’s Non-Motorized Transportation Plan are flexible concepts that serve as implementation guidelines. The high-priority project list, and perhaps the overall system and segments themselves, may change over time as a result of changing bicycling patterns, land use patterns, and implementation constraints and opportunities. Santa Clarita City Staff, in conjunction with community members, should review the project list at regular intervals to ensure that it reflects the most current priorities, needs, and opportunities for implementing the bicycle and pedestrian network in a logical and efficient manner.

Prioritization criteria were developed to reflect the transportation benefit, regional connectivity benefit, cost, safety, benefit and feasibility of each project. The ranking criteria are described in Table 7-1. The overall score of a project is the sum of individual criteria. Projects are placed into three phasing groups: Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3.

- **>47 Points:** Tier 1 projects are the highest potential bicycle and pedestrian projects and intended for near-term project implementation within 1-5 years.

- **38-47 Points:** Tier 2 projects are moderately challenging projects that can be developed within 6-10 years.

- **<38 Points:** Tier 3 projects are projects that are not currently ready to be implemented, but are included as long-term potential projects over the next 11-20 years.

A list of projects prioritized by Tiers is provided in Table 7-2. Prioritized projects do not include those projects that will be constructed as part of other development projects or are outside the City’s jurisdiction (see Table 7-7).
Table 7-1
Project Ranking Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description/Points</th>
<th>Maximum Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Benefits</td>
<td>Increases use of non-motorized travel by providing access to the following destinations within 1/2 mile of the proposed project</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Schools: 5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Major Destinations: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Parks &amp; Recreation: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to Transit: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>Provides an essential link in the proposed network or provides a regional link: 10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This link is important as a ‘stand alone project, but not critical to the overall system: 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a long-term element and potential future link: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Project can be implemented for: &lt; $50,000 (10)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 - $1,000,000 (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; $1,000,000 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Project is expected to improve non-motorized safety greatly (10)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is expected to improve non-motorized safety somewhat (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is expected to improve non-motorized safety minimally (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constructability</td>
<td>Project has barriers that require significant further study (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project requires further study but is likely to be advanced (5)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project is feasible and ready for implementation (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Use</td>
<td>Bicyclists: 8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pedestrians / Runners: 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equestrian: 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maximum Score</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 7-2
Projects by Tier

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Estimated Transportation Benefits (20 max)</th>
<th>Connectivity (10 max)</th>
<th>Cost (10 max)</th>
<th>Safety (10 max)</th>
<th>Constructability (10 max)</th>
<th>Multiple Uses (20 max)</th>
<th>Score (80 max)</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden Oak Road and Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Tibbitts</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seco Canyon Road and Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley St</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Way and Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street – Main Street Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Gap Closure Industrial Center</td>
<td>Pedestrian Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Visibility Crosswalk Installation</td>
<td>Pedestrian Program</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Princesa (Golden Valley Road to Lost)</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Funding and Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Estimated Transportation Benefits</th>
<th>Connectivity</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Constructability</th>
<th>Multiple Uses</th>
<th>Score (80 max)</th>
<th>Tier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon Road (Via Princessa to Medley Ridge Drive)</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Road (Green Mountain Road to east of CA-14)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espuella Drive</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerita Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Avenue/Peachland Avenue</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Avenue/Avenue Rotella</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail Extension (Orchard Village Road to Lyons Avenue)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail - South</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail - Center</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (Existing path to Golden Valley Road)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Parkway/Creekside Drive</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (south side of river, excluding Vista Canyon Improvements)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (Golden Valley Road to Canyon View Drive)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Type of Facility</td>
<td>Estimated Transportation Benefits (20 max)</td>
<td>Connectivity (10 max)</td>
<td>Cost (10 max)</td>
<td>Safety (10 max)</td>
<td>Constructability (10 max)</td>
<td>Multiple Uses (20 max)</td>
<td>Score (80 max)</td>
<td>Tier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail - North</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Creek (Market Street to Sierra Highway)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Creek Bike Path (Newhall Avenue to Sierra Highway)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail (east side) – connection to existing path (Magic Mountain Parkway planned extension to Via Princessa planned extension)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3. Cost Breakdown

7.3.1. Cost Summary

This plan recommends the City fund a total of 17.3 miles of new Class I Bike Paths, 6.7 miles of new Class II bike lanes, and 15.7 miles of Class III Bike Routes. Recommendations for City-funded pedestrian facilities include improvements at nine intersections, a high-visibility crossing program, and a sidewalk gap closure program. The total cost of constructing the recommended bicycle projects is estimated at $31.4 million dollars and the estimated cost of the pedestrian projects is estimated at $6.8 million dollars. A summary of improvement costs is provided in Table 7-3 and Table 7-4. Improvement costs for individual projects are provided in Table 7-5 and Table 7-6.

Unless otherwise noted, cost estimates are based on per-mile averages of bikeway construction in California. Estimates include 15% for survey and design work, 20% for contingency and 20% for construction administration. Cost estimates are in 2012 dollars. Cost estimates are planning level, and do not include feasibility, environmental clearance or acquisition costs. Project-specific factors such as grading, landscaping, intersection modification, right-of-way acquisition, and bridge construction may increase the actual cost of construction, sometimes significantly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Cost Per Mile</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I Bicycle Path</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$30,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Bicycle Lane</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$268,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Route – Standard</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$352,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Bicycle Route – Bike Boulevard</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian Improvements</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td>$6,766,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$38,214,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Notes: Costs are in 2012 dollars*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>$1,686,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>$24,068,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>$12,460,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,214,500</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Mileage does not match that presented in Chapter 5 as it excludes projects that will be constructed as part of other development projects.

2 Based on cost to construct the Iron Horse Trail.
All the projects are recommended for implementation over the next twenty years. However, due to the unpredictability of funding sources, economy and community support, some projects, especially those that require right-of-way purchase or coordination with multiple jurisdictions, may not be completed within the next twenty years. A description of available funding sources is provided at the end of this chapter.

This total cost of projects does not include cost estimates for projects that will be funded as part of future road construction or private development projects. Projects associated with future road construction and private development are listed in Table 7-7.
### Table 7-5

**Recommended Bicycle Facilities: Planning Level Construction Cost Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail - South</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail - Center</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bouquet Canyon Road Creek Trail - North</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>$2,520,000</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley Road (Green Mountain Road to east of CA-14)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$1,260,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Road Bridge Upgrade</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>$6,700,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Includes bridge widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Creek (Market Street to Sierra Highway)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$2,240,000</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Creek Bike Path (Newhall Avenue to Sierra Highway)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>$2,660,000</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Ranch Road</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$420,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue Rail with Trail</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$1,820,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (west)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$2,240,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (west-center)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (portion of southeast) (south side of river,</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$3,220,000</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excluding Vista Canyon improvements)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail (east side) – connection to existing path</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>$1,820,000</td>
<td>Tier 3</td>
<td>Along flood control channel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Magic Mountain Parkway planned extension to Via Princessa planned extension)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fork Trail Extension (Orchard Village Road to Lyons)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>$980,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Along flood control channel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Type of Facility</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avenue)</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>$30,780,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bike Paths</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avenue Tibbitts</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>This segment only includes the portion of the road within City limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>$68,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Time-restricted bike lanes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Princessa</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>$268,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espuella Drive</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley St</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerita Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Section between Via Princessa and Soledad Canyon Road is physically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>constrained and will require additional study and work to bring up to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bike route standards. Additional work not included in cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Highway</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>$22,500</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walnut Street – Main Street Bike</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Average bike boulevard cost per mile used is $30,000; cost varies by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>level of treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Road</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Bike Routes</td>
<td>Class III Bike Route</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>$400,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>38.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,448,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7-6
Recommended Pedestrian Facilities: Planning Level Construction Cost Estimates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Gap Closure Industrial Center</td>
<td>Pedestrian Program</td>
<td>$6,300,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>Phase 1, Avenue Scott: $2.0 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 2, Rye Canyon: $1.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 3, Avenue Stanford, $1.1 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phase 4, Anza Drive and Avenue Tibbitts, $1.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Visibility Crosswalk Installation</td>
<td>Pedestrian Program</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>At major arterial-arterial intersections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Gap Closure McBean Parkway</td>
<td>Pedestrian Program</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McBean Parkway/Creekside Drive</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Avenue/Peachland Avenue</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons Avenue/Avenue Rotella</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad Avenue with Trail</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>Tier 2</td>
<td>At 15th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seco Canyon Road and Bouquet Canyon Road</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuter Way and Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td>At Reuther Ave and Rainbow Glen Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck Pontius Commuter Rail Trail</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Oak Road and Soledad Canyon Road</td>
<td>Intersection Improvements</td>
<td>$51,000</td>
<td>Tier 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$7,166,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7-7
Projects Associated with Future Road Construction, Development or Outside City Jurisdiction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Miles</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (northeast)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Future Development. Section between Bouquet Canyon Road and River Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (center)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Future Development. Short Spur near Santa Clarita Metrolink Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara River Trail (portion of southeast)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Future Development. Vista Canyon improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Extension (planned)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Plum Canyon Road to Newhall Ranch Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magic Mountain Parkway</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Road Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Town Center North-South Connector</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Could be condition from developer of mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Princessa Extension (east and west)</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Road Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand Canyon</td>
<td>Class I Bike Path</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>Road Widening. North of Soledad Canyon Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bike Paths</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shadow Pines</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>County Jurisdiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dockweiler Drive Extension</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Road Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Road Widening. Gap connector. City project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Town Center North-South Connector</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Could be condition from developer of mall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copper Hill Drive (Haskell Canyon Rd to David Way)</td>
<td>Class II Bike Lanes</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Road Widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Bike Lanes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Santa Clarita GIS Department Master Trail System Map 2006.

7.3.2. Maintenance Costs

The existing and recommended bikeway network is predominately made up of bike paths, which require regular maintenance and repair as needed. On-street bikeways are maintained as part of the normal roadway maintenance program and extra emphasis should be put on keeping the bike lanes and roadway shoulders clear of debris and keeping vegetation overgrowth from blocking visibility or creeping into the roadway. The other typical maintenance costs for the bikeway network, as shown in Table 7-8, Cost Estimates for Recommended Network: Ten-Year Operations and Maintenance include the maintenance of signage, striping and stencils.
7. Funding and Implementation

The total annual budget increase related to bikeway maintenance cost is estimated to be about $270,000 per year, and approximately $3.7 million over ten years, assuming all of the projects proposed in this Plan are implemented. Maintenance costs also assume that the City will maintain privately funded trails and bikeways, and therefore include the bikeways listed in Table 7-7.

### Table 7-8
Cost Estimates for Recommended Network: Ten-Year Operations and Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Length (Miles)</th>
<th>Yearly Cost</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class I</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>Miles/Year</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>$234,600</td>
<td>Lighting and debris and removal of vegetation overgrowth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Miles/Year</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>$23,200</td>
<td>Repainting lane stripes and stencils, sign replacement as needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>Miles/Year</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>$15,700</td>
<td>Sign and shared use stencil replacement as needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg. Cost/Year** $273,500

**Est. 10-Year Cost** (2016 dollars) $3,782,270

7.4. Funding

There are a variety of potential funding sources including local, state, regional, and federal funding programs as well as private sector funding that can be used to construct the proposed bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Most of the federal, state, and regional programs are competitive and involve the completion of extensive applications with clear documentation of the project need, costs, and benefits. Local funding for bicycle projects typically comes from Transportation Development Act (TDA) funding, which is prorated to each County based on the return of gasoline taxes.

7.4.1. Federal Funds

The passage of the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) in 1991 signaled a major change to allocation of federal funding for transportation projects. As the first federal legislation after the completion of the Interstate Highway System, ISTEA presented an intermodal approach to transportation planning and funding, giving additional control to the country’s Metropolitan Planning Organizations. ISTEA and subsequent transportation legislation, the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) (1998) and the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act, a Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) (2005), have allocated dedicated funding for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects and programs. Bicycle and pedestrian projects are funded at a very small

---

3 Includes projects not prioritized since the City will take over maintenance responsibilities even if bikeways are constructed as part of larger development projects.
percentage compared to highway projects, but SAFETEA-LU provided broader eligibility requirements than previous acts that allow bicycle and pedestrian projects to qualify for traditional “highway” funding.

On June 29, 2012 a new transportation bill, MAP-21, was passed that has many changes to the funding of bicycle and pedestrian projects. SAFETEA-LU, the previous legislation, contained dedicated programs including Transportation Enhancements, Safe Routes to School, and Recreational Trails, which were all commonly tapped sources of funding to make non-motorized improvements nationwide. MAP-21 combines these programs into a single source called ‘Transportation Alternatives.’ At the time of publication of this plan, these funding mechanisms are new, and it will take some time to fully understand all of the implications of MAP-21 and to get this new program up and running.

MAP-21 Funds
According to the FHWA, MAP-21’s Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) “provides funding for programs and projects defined as transportation alternatives, including on- and off-road pedestrian and bicycle facilities, infrastructure projects for improving non-driver access to public transportation and enhanced mobility, community improvement activities, and environmental mitigation; recreational trail program projects; safe routes to school projects; and projects for the planning, design or construction of boulevards and other roadways largely in the right-of-way of former Interstate System routes or other divided highways.”

Nationwide, MAP-21 provides States $808,760,000 in fiscal year 2013 and $819,900,000 in fiscal year 2014, totaling to $1,628,660,000 over the two-year lifetime of the bill. This is a reduction in funding from $1.2 billion annually, a reduction of approximately one third. California’s TAP funding can be calculated by dividing the nationwide total based on its proportionate share of funding from the Transportation Enhancements program in fiscal year 2009. Additionally, states may ‘opt-out’ of up to 50 percent of the funding and use it for other projects. If California decides to opt-out, this will result in a reduction in dedicated funding for transportation alternative related improvements by up to two-thirds when compared to 2011 levels. For most TAP projects, including Safe Routes to School, the Federal share is 80 percent Federal and the State share is 20 percent (or local match with a sliding scale). This represents an increase in local match from prior funding sources.

More information on TAP, including eligible activities, can be found at:
http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm

7.4.2. Statewide Funding Sources

The State of California uses both federal sources and its own budget to fund pedestrian projects and programs. In some cases, such as Safe Routes to School, Office of Traffic Safety, and Environmental Justice grants, project sponsors apply directly to the State for funding. In others, sponsors apply to a regional agency.

Recreational Trails Program (RTP)

www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/recrails/index.htm

In California, RTP funds are administered by the California State Parks Department. Recreational Trails Program funds may be used for the following:

4 http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm
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- Maintenance and restoration of existing trails;
- Purchase and lease of trail construction and maintenance equipment;
- Construction of new trails;
- Acquisition of easements or property for trails; and
- Operation of educational programs to promote safety and environmental protection related to trails (limited to five percent of a State’s funds).

$2.1 million statewide was available in fiscal year 2011. Under MAP-21, RTP funding is a set-aside from the TAP. Unless the Governor opts out in advance, an amount equal to the State’s FY 2009 RTP apportionment is to be set aside from the State’s TAP funds for recreational trails projects.5

Land and Water Conservation Fund

www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=21360

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is a federal program that provides grants for planning and acquiring outdoor recreation areas and facilities, including trails. The Fund is administered by the California State Parks Department and has been reauthorized until 2015.

Cities, counties and districts authorized to acquire, develop, operate and maintain park and recreation facilities are eligible to apply. Applicants must fund the entire project, and will be reimbursed for 50 percent of costs. Property acquired or developed under the program must be retained in perpetuity for public recreational use. The grant process for local agencies is competitive, and sixty percent of grants are reserved for Southern California.

Approximately $1.7 million is available annually statewide.

Active Transportation Program

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/LocalPrograms/atp/index.html

On September 26, 2013, Governor Brown signed legislation creating the Active Transportation Program (ATP) in the Department of Transportation (Senate Bill 99, Chapter 359 and Assembly Bill 101, Chapter 354). The ATP consolidates existing federal and state transportation programs, including the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP), Bicycle Transportation Account (BTA), and State Safe Routes to School (SR2S), into a single program with a focus to make California a national leader in active transportation. The ATP administered by the Division of Local Assistance, Office of Active Transportation and Special Programs. The purpose of ATP is to encourage increased use of active modes of transportation by achieving the following goals:

- Increase the proportion of trips accomplished by biking and walking,
- Increase safety and mobility for non-motorized users,
- Advance the active transportation efforts of regional agencies to achieve greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction goals,

5 http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/map21/guidance/guidetap.cfm
• Enhance public health,

• Ensure that disadvantaged communities fully share in the benefits of the program, and

• Provide a broad spectrum of projects to benefit many types of active transportation users.

Environmental Justice: Context Sensitive Planning Grants
http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/ejandtitlevi.html
The Caltrans-administered Environmental Justice: Context Sensitive Planning Grants Program funds planning activities that assist low-income, minority, and Native American communities in becoming active participants in transportation planning and project development. Grants are available to transit districts, cities, counties, and tribal governments. This grant is funded by the State Highway Account at $1.5 million annually statewide. Grants are capped at $250,000.

Office of Traffic Safety (OTS) Grants
http://www.ots.ca.gov/Grants/Program_Information/default.asp
The California Office of Traffic Safety distributes federal funding apportioned to California under MAP-21. Grants are used to establish new traffic safety programs, expand ongoing programs to address deficiencies in current programs. Bicycle and pedestrian safety are included in the list of traffic safety priority areas. Eligible grantees include governmental agencies, state colleges and state universities, local city and county government agencies, school districts, fire departments, and public emergency services providers. Grant funding cannot replace existing program expenditures, nor can traffic safety funds be used for program maintenance, research, rehabilitation, or construction. Grants are awarded on a competitive basis, and priority is given to agencies with the greatest need. Evaluation criteria to assess these needs include potential traffic safety impact, collision statistics and rankings, seriousness of problems, and performance on previous OTS grants. Grant funding amounts through OTS vary by fiscal year.

7.4.3. Regional Funding Sources

Regional bicycle and pedestrian grant programs come from a variety of sources, including federal transportation funding, the State budget, and sales taxes. Regional funds are administered by the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority.

TDA Article 3
http://www.metro.net/projects/TDA/
Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 funds are available for transit, bicycle and pedestrian projects in California. According to the Act, pedestrian and bicycle projects are allocated two percent of the revenue from a ¼ cent of the general state sales tax, which is dedicated to local transportation. These funds are collected by the State, returned to each county based on sales tax revenues, and typically apportioned to areas within the county based on population. Eligible pedestrian and bicycle projects include construction and engineering for capital projects; maintenance of bikeways; bicycle safety education programs; and development of comprehensive bicycle or pedestrian facilities plans. A city or county is allowed to apply for funding for bicycle or pedestrian plans not more than once every five years. These funds may be used to meet local match requirements for federal funding sources.
Metro Call for Projects

http://www.metro.net/projects/call_projects/

Metro programs a variety of federal, state, and local revenues to regionally significant projects in the Transportation Improvement Program for Los Angeles County through a competitive “Call for Projects.” Projects that create benefits for bicycle transportation can be funded, if eligible and competitive, through three modal categories: 1) Regional Bikeways and Pedestrian Improvements, 2) Transportation Demand Management, and 3) Transportation Enhancement. Metro accepts Call for Projects applications every other year.

Proposition A

http://www.metro.net/projects/local_return_pgm/

In 1980, Los Angeles County residents voted to establish a half-cent sales tax dedicated to transportation funding. One-fourth of the funds go to Local Return Programs. The monies help these entities develop and improve local public transit, paratransit, and related transportation infrastructure.

Proposition C 20% Local Return

http://www.metro.net/projects/local_return_pgm/

These revenues are generated from L.A. County’s ½-cent sales tax for public transit purposes. Funds can be used for congestion management programs, bikeways and bike lanes, transit-related TDM programs, street improvements supporting public transit service and related services to meet the Federal requirements for Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Metro is required to distribute Local Return funds directly to the cities on a per capita basis. To expend the Prop C 20% funds, local jurisdictions must submit forms for Metro approval.

Measure R

http://www.metro.net/projects/local_return_pgm/

In 2008, Los Angeles County voters approved a half-cent sales tax to finance new transportation projects and programs, and accelerate many of those already in process. Metro estimates that Measure R will result in $40 billion toward congestion relief and transportation improvements throughout the Los Angeles County over the next 30 years. Bicycle and pedestrian projects are eligible uses of Measure R funds.

7.4.4. Non-Traditional Funding Sources

Adopt-A-Trail Programs

Adopt-A-Trail Programs can be used to fund new construction, renovation, trail brochures, informational kiosks and other amenities. These programs can also be extended to include sponsorship of trail segments for maintenance needs.

Integration into Larger Projects

California State’s “routine accommodation” policies require Caltrans to design, construct, operate, and maintain transportation facilities using best practices for pedestrians and bicyclists. Local jurisdictions can begin to expect that some portion of bicycle and pedestrian project costs, when they are built as part of larger transportation projects, will be covered in project construction budgets. This applies to Caltrans and other transportation facilities, such as new Metrolink stations.
Community Development Block Grants

www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/index.cfm

The CDBG program provides money for streetscape revitalization, which may be largely comprised of bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Federal Community Development Block Grant Grantees may use CDBG funds for activities that include (but are not limited to) acquiring real property; building public facilities and improvements, such as streets, sidewalks, and recreational facilities; and planning and administrative expenses, such as costs related to developing a consolidated Plan and managing CDBG funds.

The City of Santa Clarita receives CDBG Entitlement funds annually from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The 2012-2013 CDBG entitlement allocation is $1,083,757.

Requirements for New Development

With the increasing support for “routine accommodation” and “complete streets,” requirements for new development, road widening, and new commercial development provide opportunities to construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities more efficiently.

Impact Fees

One potential local source of funding is developer impact fees, typically tied to trip generation rates and traffic impacts produced by a proposed project. The City of Santa Clarita currently collects Bridge and Thoroughfare Fees and Transit Impact fees from developers to provide necessary infrastructure and transit-related improvements.

Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act

The Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act was passed by the Legislature in 1982 in response to reduced funding opportunities brought about by the passage of Proposition 13. The Mello-Roos Act allows any county, city, special district, school district, or joint powers of authority to establish a Community Facility District (CFD) for the purpose of selling tax-exempt bonds to fund public improvements within that district. CFDs must be approved by a two-thirds margin of qualified voters in the district. Property owners within the district are responsible for paying back the bonds. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are eligible for funding under CFD bonds.

Bikes Belong Grant

Bikes Belong provides grants for up to $10,000 with a 50% match that recipients may use towards paths, bridges and parks. Grant applications are due several times per year.

Community Action for a Renewed Environment (CARE)

http://www.epa.gov/care/

The US EPA administers this grant program to help communities organize and take action to reduce toxic pollution in their local environments. Applicants must fall within the statutory terms of EPA's research and demonstration grant authorities. CARE request for proposals were not issued in 2012.
7.5. Implementation Strategies

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan provides the long-term vision for the development of a citywide biking and walking network that can be used by all residents for all types of trips. Implementation of the Plan will take place in small steps over many years. The following strategies, action items and measures of effectiveness are provided to guide the City toward the vision identified in the Plan.

7.5.1. Strategy 1: Establish Implementation Responsibility

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan recommends the establishment of a Non-Motorized Transportation Planner position (full or part-time) within the City to implement and update the Plan. Establishment of this position is contingent on available funding.

**Action Item:** The City shall determine the duties, time required and departmental affiliation for a Non-Motorized Transportation Planner. Once determined, the City shall pursue funding for the position and hire or assign duties as appropriate.

7.5.2. Strategy 2: Strategically Pursue Infrastructure Projects

City staff should strategically pursue infrastructure projects. Ideally, City staff should pursue capital improvements funding or grant funding for high-priority bicycle and pedestrian improvements first. However, if grant requirements, or construction in conjunction with another roadway project make construction of a lower priority project possible, then the City should pursue funding sources for that project regardless of priority. Additionally, regardless of the priority placed upon a bicycle or pedestrian project, it is intended that an approved bicycle or pedestrian project be installed simultaneous to road improvements projects scheduled in the same area.

**Action Item:** At the end of each fiscal year, City shall publish a public report documenting the status and ongoing actions for all bicycle and pedestrian projects. This report may be combined with the prioritization review discussed below. First update due July 2013.

7.5.3. Strategy 3: Regularly Revisit Project Prioritization

Projects have been prioritized based on transportation benefit, regional connectivity benefit, cost, safety and feasibility. This list should be reviewed every fiscal year, with new projects added, completed projects removed, and the priorities revised as conditions change.

**Action Item:** Annual review and update of non-motorized transportation plan project list. Updated list to be shared with the public. First update due July 2013.

7.5.4. Strategy 4: Update the Plan

While this Plan is intended to guide Santa Clarita's non-motorized transportation planning for the next 20 years, it should be reviewed and updated on a regular basis. To be eligible for State Bicycle Transportation Account funding, the bicycle portion of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan should be updated every five years. Other components of the Plan should be reviewed every five years and updated as needed.
**Action Item:** Update BTA Compliance Document every five years, starting in 2018. Other elements of the Plan shall be reviewed and updated as needed.

### 7.5.5. Strategy 5: Establish Measures of Effectiveness

Measures of effectiveness are used as a qualitative way to measure the City’s progress toward implementing the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan. Well-crafted measures of effectiveness measure progress toward meeting an agreed-upon goal, include measurable indicators of progress, and include time-sensitive targets for the City to meet.

**Table 7-9, Potential Measures of Effectiveness** describes several measures that the City may consider. These measures were developed for the 2008 plan based on known baseline conditions and have been updated for this plan. The City has met or made progress toward meeting several benchmarks since adoption of the 2008 plan:

- The City has increased the mileage of Class I bike paths, Class II bike lanes, and Class III bike routes
- Nearly all elementary schools are participating in the Safe Routes to School Program
- The League of American Bicyclists designated Santa Clarita as a bronze level Bicycle Friendly Community
- Reduction in bicycle and pedestrian collisions by 2010
- The City has received grant funding each year through Safe Routes to School, Metro, and Caltrans

Goal targets, when given, are developed based on reasonable expectations within the time frame. As new baseline information is discovered as conditions change, and as the City implements more of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the measures of effectiveness should be reevaluated, revised and updated. The City should regularly review the progress made toward these targets, preferably on an annual or biennial basis.

The City of Santa Monica has been using measures of effectiveness (“indicators”) since 1994 to measure the progress the City has made toward becoming sustainable. Santa Clarita should consider reviewing Santa Monica’s sustainability report card and sustainability indicators as a guide for developing their own non-motorized measures of effectiveness. Santa Monica provides its Sustainable City Report Card online at http://www.smgov.net/Departments/OSE/categories/sustainability.aspx
Table 7-9  
Potential Measures of Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2012 Benchmark (if available)</th>
<th>2012 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle and pedestrian mode share</td>
<td>14% bike to work&lt;br&gt;8% bike to transit&lt;br&gt;3% bike to school&lt;br&gt;14% bike to go shopping&lt;br&gt;5% walk to work&lt;br&gt;10% walk to transit&lt;br&gt;6% walk to school&lt;br&gt;27% walk to go shopping</td>
<td>By 2018 increase the percentage of people who bike and walk for utilitarian purposes by 50%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trail use</td>
<td>Benchmark data to be established.&lt;br&gt;City should conduct regular counts with an objective sampling method.</td>
<td>Double recreational trail use by 2018.&lt;br&gt;Increase commuter/utilitarian trail use by 50% by 2018.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public attitudes about walking and biking in Santa Clarita</td>
<td>The 2007 Online Biking and Walking Survey provides some information, but a survey specifically geared toward attitudes of bikers, non-bikers, walkers and non-walkers should be developed.</td>
<td>Increase in positive attitudes about walking and biking, about bicycle facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of miles of bike paths, lanes and routes</td>
<td>36.4 miles of bike paths&lt;br&gt;24.4 miles of bike lanes&lt;br&gt;5.4 miles of bike routes</td>
<td>Increase in bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Arterial Streets with Bike Lanes</td>
<td>Benchmark data to be established.</td>
<td>Increase in the proportion of arterial streets with bicycle facilities. Suggested target of 25% by 2018 to spur greater bicycle commuting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Schools with Safe Routes to Schools Programs</td>
<td>27 out of 28 Elementary Schools</td>
<td>Expand Safe Routes to School Program to middle schools by 2018. Continued development of Safe Routes to School Program at high schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent recognition of Non-Motorized Transportation Planning Efforts</td>
<td>Designated bronze level Bicycle Friendly Community by League of American Bicyclists</td>
<td>League of American Bicyclists’s Silver Award by 2018 and Gold Award by 2028.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of collisions involving a) pedestrians and drivers and b) bicyclists and drivers</td>
<td>2008: 25 bike, 34 pedestrian&lt;br&gt;2009: 37 bike, 42 pedestrian&lt;br&gt;2010: 23 bike, 29 pedestrian</td>
<td>Reduction in bicycle and pedestrian collision rate per capita by 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant funding received for Non-Motorized Transportation Projects</td>
<td>2007: $1,070,000 (Bicycle Transportation Account, Safe Routes to School)&lt;br&gt;2009: $1,003,063 (Safe Routes to School, Bicycle Transportation Account, Metro Call for Projects)</td>
<td>Receive an annual average of $400,000 or more in non-motorized transportation grants. Evaluate every five years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Santa Clarita Non-Motorized Transportation Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2012 Benchmark (if available)</th>
<th>2012 Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2010: $213,300 (Safe Routes to School)</td>
<td>2012: $450,000 (Safe Routes to School)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of community with access to trail or paseo</td>
<td>Baseline to be established</td>
<td>90% of residents live within ½ mile of a paseo or bicycle facility by 2028.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Safe Routes to School

The City of Santa Clarita began its Safe Routes to School efforts during the development of the first Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, between 2006 and 2008. Since then, the City has successfully funded Safe Routes efforts through state and federal grant sources, and just concluded a pilot education and encouragement program in 2011. This chapter explains Safe Routes to School concepts and summarizes the work the City has undertaken since 2006. The chapter consists of the following sections:

8.1 Introduction identifies the aspects of a Safe Routes to School Program. (Page 8-1)

8.2 Santa Clarita's Safe Routes to School Program describes the improvements made as part of the citywide program established in 2008. (Page 8-2)

8.3 School Prioritization explains the school ranking criteria and prioritizes middle and high schools to compete for grant funding. (Page 8-5)

8.4 Elementary School Walk Audit Notes presents recommended improvements for elementary schools that have not yet been awarded grant funding. (Page 8-9)

8.5 Junior High and High School Notes presents information about walking and biking at junior high and high schools. (Page 8-19)

8.6 Next Steps describes the City's future plans for the Safe Routes to School Program. (Page 8-21)

8.1. Introduction

Safe Routes to School (SR2S) refers to a variety of multi-disciplinary programs aimed at promoting walking and bicycling to school, and improving traffic safety around school areas through education, incentives, increased law enforcement, and engineering measures. Safe Routes to School programs typically involve partnerships among municipalities, school districts, community and parent volunteers, and law enforcement agencies. The City of Santa Clarita has been successful in working with school districts and parents to identify, fund, and construct infrastructure improvements and implement education and encouragement programs throughout the city.

Comprehensive Safe Routes to School programs use five complementary strategies, referred to as the “Five Es”:

**Engineering** – Design, implementation and maintenance of signing, striping, and infrastructure improvements designed to improve the safety of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists along school commute routes.

**Enforcement** – Strategies to deter the unsafe behavior of drivers, bicyclists and pedestrians and encourage all road users to obey traffic laws and share the road.
**Encouragement** – Special events, clubs, contests and ongoing activities that encourage more walking, bicycling, or carpooling through fun and incentives.

**Education** – Educational programs that teach students bicycle, pedestrian and traffic safety skills, and teach drivers how to share the road safely.

**Evaluation** – Strategies to determine which programs are most effective and identify ways to improve programs.

### 8.2. Santa Clarita’s Safe Routes to School Program

In 2007, during development of Santa Clarita’s first Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the City began Safe Routes to School programs in earnest. The City used land use, socioeconomic, and transportation data to score and rank all public elementary schools within the city limits. The highest scoring school from Newhall Unified School District and Sulphur Springs Unified School District, and the top two schools from Saugus Unified School District were selected to receive walk audits. Infrastructure improvements identified in the walk audit were incorporated into the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and have been constructed.

In 2008, the City of Santa Clarita received a State of California Safe Routes to School grant and expanded the program to cover all 27 of the City’s public elementary schools. The expansion allowed the City to conduct walk audits at the remaining elementary schools, and to provide education and encouragement programming at four pilot schools. The education and encouragement programming is described in the next section.

In 2012, the City conducted three additional walk audits at elementary schools in unincorporated Los Angeles County that would become City jurisdiction as the result of annexation later in the year.

The City has been working down the prioritized list of schools to apply for grant funding to construct infrastructure improvements. Each grant cycle, three schools are selected—one from each of the three school districts. For six consecutive years, the City has been awarded State or Federal Safe Routes to School funding to implement the infrastructure improvements. **Table 8-1** describes the improvements implemented at each school through funding received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Walk Audit</th>
<th>Grant Submitted</th>
<th>Funded</th>
<th>Constructed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Springs Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedarcreek Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emblem Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Walk Audit</td>
<td>Grant Submitted</td>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>Constructed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Oaks Ranch Elementary School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Oak Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmers Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Foster Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leona Cox Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGrath Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadows Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain View Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhall Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Park Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Orchard Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peachland Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinetree Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plum Canyon Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Vista Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosedell Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clarita Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyblue Mesa Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia Valley Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley View Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8.2.1. Education and Encouragement Programming

Between 2009 and 2011, the City provided education and encouragement programming at four pilot elementary schools: Rio Vista Elementary, Old Orchard Elementary, Pinetree Elementary, and North Park Elementary. These four schools were selected as pilot schools based on district support, and demographic and geographic characteristics, including the number of bicycle and pedestrian collisions near the school, the percentage of no-car households within the school area and the population density within the school area.

Education and encouragement programming included:

- Teachers, school administrators, district staff and city staff attending walk audits at elementary schools to identify infrastructure improvements that could improve walking and bicycling to school;
- Citywide publicity provided through the Safe Routes to School website and the semi-annual newsletter. Safe Routes to School sponsored a booth and bike rodeo at the City’s Arbor Day Event in 2010 and 2011;
- A Safe Routes to School Toolkit that was developed and made available to all elementary schools; and
- Four pilot schools receiving focused education and encouragement programs:
  - In-classroom education and hands-on bicycle rodeos and traffic safety programs for all students
  - Walk and Bike to School Day promotions in fall 2009 and 2010
  - Walking School Bus Training and establishment of walking school busses
  - Safe Routes to School information at school events such as Back to School Night
- Evaluation efforts included in-classroom hand tallies to track how students get to and from school, parent surveys to understand parent attitudes toward walking and biking to school and knowledge of the SR2S program, and an administrator survey to identify existing SR2S efforts.

8.2.2. Previously Existing Programs

Prior to the implementation of the citywide Safe Routes to School Program, Santa Clarita had several programs already in place.

The City Traffic Engineering staff develops and maintains Suggested Route to School Maps for all primary schools located within the city limits. The maps are updated as necessary, and made available to each school.
The City of Santa Clarita also hires and trains adult crossing guards. Typical locations include uncontrolled intersections, stop sign controlled intersections with high vehicle volumes (500+ per hour) and signal controlled intersections with high conflicting turning movements.

In 2002, the City, the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department (which serves as local law enforcement for Santa Clarita) and the local school districts established School Valet Programs at most elementary schools in Santa Clarita. The program uses the 5th and 6th grade students as valets to open the car doors of arriving students in a specially designed drop-off area. The drop-off area allows 10 to 15 cars at a time to enter, drop off children, and leave in as little as 55 seconds. Fourth grade students assist as escorts or walkers. These students walk the younger ones to their classroom or a line up area so the parents do not have to park and escort their children onto the campus. The program has dramatically reduced traffic congestion around the schools, and improved safety for students who choose to walk and bicycle to schools. Though this program is focused on improving drop-off conditions, it is necessary to have an orderly drop-off so that parents will feel comfortable allowing their children to walk or bicycle to school.

The Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department runs a Sheriff’s Teen Traffic Offender Program (STTOP). This program provides an opportunity for citizens to call the Sheriff’s Department and report hazardous teen drivers. An officer will contact the offending teens and their parents in order to correct their behavior. By improving teen driving behavior, this program improves the safety for all who use the streets, including students who walk and bike to school.

### 8.3. School Prioritization

The City of Santa Clarita ranked all elementary schools within city limits in the 2007 plan by a set of weighted criteria. This plan re-ranks the six elementary schools that the City has not yet submitted for grant funding, as well as junior high and high schools within Santa Clarita. The prioritization criteria and weighting is shown in Table 8-2. Table 8-3 displays the results of the prioritization.
**Table 8-2: Prioritization Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population density</td>
<td>Points assigned based on density of housing within half a mile of the school; higher points for higher density housing</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian/bicycle collisions</td>
<td>Points assigned based on number of pedestrian collisions in vicinity of school (½ mile radius); higher points for more collisions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage street classification</td>
<td>Points assigned based on type of street school frontage is on (e.g., 3 points arterial, 2 points collector, 1 point residential)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of an arterial crossing</td>
<td>Points assigned based on whether students are required to cross an arterial on their walking route to school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of car-free households</td>
<td>Points assigned based on percentage of households without cars within half a mile of the school</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8-3: Prioritized Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School District</th>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>Pedestrian/Bicycle Collisions</th>
<th>Frontage Street Classification</th>
<th>Presence of Arterial Crossing</th>
<th>% of Car-Free Households</th>
<th>Unweighted Score</th>
<th>Weighted Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arroyo Seco Junior High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Placerita Junior High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Vista Junior High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saugus High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Mesa Junior High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGrath Elementary School</td>
<td>Newhall School District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helmers Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlands Elementary School</td>
<td>Saugus Union School District</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Valley High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valencia High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High School District</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley Canyon</td>
<td>Newhall School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>School District</td>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>Pedestrian/Bicycle Collisions</td>
<td>Frontage Street Classification</td>
<td>Presence of Arterial Crossing</td>
<td>% of Car-Free Households</td>
<td>Unweighted Score</td>
<td>Weighted Score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Oak Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulphur Springs Community School</td>
<td>Sulphur Springs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hart High School</td>
<td>Hart Union High</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rio Norte Middle School</td>
<td>Hart Union High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Safe Routes to School

8.4. Elementary School Walk Audit Notes

This section presents notes and observations from walk audits conducted around the elementary schools that have not yet been submitted for grant funding, as well as recommendations for improvements that can be used in future grant applications. Golden Oak Community School is new and has not yet been studied, thus it is not included below.

8.4.1. Bridgeport Elementary School

Concerns
Heavy car traffic was observed around the school approaching 8:00 AM. Traffic backed up along Newhall Ranch Road as parents waited to enter the school parking lot/valet line. The school shares a large parking lot with Bridgeport Park. Some parents were observed making double right hand turns to overtake/bypass valet traffic. There is no enforcement at the school. Bridgeport Staff observe parking infractions and children crossing. Private security service monitors the residential neighborhood to the west of the school, prohibiting vehicular access. The parking lot (partially coned off for buses during arrival and dismissal) is used by parents looking to bypass right hand turn traffic. Children walk through the large parking lot unmonitored. As Windward turns west from Bayside (the elbow), both high speeds and u-turns were observed. There are faded “slow school zone” pavement markings (southbound side of Bayside). Bayside becomes heavily congested between street parking and the unofficial “Pick-up/Drop-off” zone on the east side of Bayside. The crossing is impaired by parked cars on either side of road.

Opportunities
Northbound Bayside features a temporary, coned-off drop-off zone south of the Bayside/Spinnaker crosswalk. Temporary “slow student crossing” signs, similar to custodial (caution wet floor) signs, are in use during the drop-off and pick-up. These could be made to look more permanent. There are roundabouts with pedestrian crossing islands at Bayside and Bridgeport intersection. Children access the school from the north entrance, despite the backside being open to day care and staff. Residential areas within the “suggested route to school plan” do not have to cross a major arterial. There is great potential for high levels of walking and biking as Bridgeport has higher levels of car-free households than many Santa Clarita elementary schools.

Biking
Children are permitted to bicycle to school once they enter the 3rd grade. Children who bicycle to school are required to sign a permission form with a parent, bring a lock, and wear a helmet. Bicycle racks are located on the west side of campus, accommodating close to 30 bicycles.

Specific Location Notes and Potential Solutions
Below are potential solutions identified during the audit. Recommended improvements are shown in Figure 8-1.

- Possible bulbout at Spinnaker and Bayside.
- Explore need for crossing guard.
- Enhance crosswalk striping and street stencils.
- Potentially very high levels of walking and biking students, given topography and school boundaries.
Figure 8-1: Bridgeport Elementary School Recommended Improvements

- Restripe street stencils
- Construct bulb-outs; explore need for crossing guard
- Stripe high visibility crosswalk
- Restripe street stencils
8.4.2. Helmers Elementary School

**Concerns**
The primary concern of Charles Helmers staff is visibility along Grandview Dr. Street parking is utilized on both sides of Grandview Dr. As curbside parking space is taken, visibility of both motorists and children crossing the street is minimized. Visibility becomes an issue where Grandview Dr. intersects Chadsford Dr. and Phillbrook Ave. Both intersections are monitored by a crossing guard, but the intersections do not have stop signs. Being able to see the crossing guards in advance is essential to children’s safety. Non-standard signage, resembling stop signs from behind, confuses drivers and pedestrians. Traffic enforcement is another area of concern at Charles Helmers. Charles Helmers is immediately adjacent to Northbridge Park. The park provides ample street parking space for parents to drop off or wait for their children. The street space nearest the school is quickly occupied. As parking space becomes limited nearest the school, parents often double park or make illegal u-turns in search of optimal pick-up/drop-off locations. Kids run across Grandview Dr. between parked cars to get to their parents’ cars on the other side. Some parents stop at the north driveway while their kids get into the vehicle.

**Opportunities**
Charles Helmers is located in an ideal location for walking and bicycling to school. School grounds are immediately next to Northbridge Park. Northbridge Park features a path that connects to an entrance to the north side of campus. South of Phillbrook Ave., a paseo connects Charles Helmers with the residential neighborhoods west of the school. A majority of homes within the school boundary does not require the crossing of major arterials, and residents on the north side of Decoro Dr. can access Charles Helmers via the paseo network. Charles Helmers is in a bike/walk to school friendly neighborhood, but does not have commensurate levels of bicycling and walking students. Staff reported that most kids are taken to school by parents in cars.

**Biking**
Students in grades 3-6 are permitted to bicycle to school. Bicycle racks are provided for children to park their bike.

**Specific Location Notes and Potential Solutions**
Listed below are potential solutions identified during the walk audit. Recommended improvements are shown in Figure 8-2.

- Site could benefit from periodic enforcement. Many illegal behaviors observed during audit.
- Charles Helmers appears to be an ideal location for walk and bike to school education programs.
- Number of students that walk or bike to school could be increased through parent support and encouragement from school events or programs.
- Assess need for stop control at both intersections along Grandview.
- Use a valet system in the afternoon, similar to the one currently implemented in the morning.
Figure 8-2: Helmer Elementary School Recommended Improvements

- Implement Valet System for Afternoon
- Assess need for stop control
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Charles-Helmer Elementary School
8.4.3. Highlands Elementary School

Concerns
The entrance of Highlands is located at the intersection of Empino Ln. and Catala Ave. Both slope downhill towards the school, naturally increasing the speed of vehicle traffic as they approach the school. The east portion of the crosswalk on the north leg of the intersection lines up halfway with the school driveway facing the vehicles exiting the school parking lot. When a vehicle pulls up to the driveway to exit the school parking lot, it is either directly behind or facing the kids crossing at the crosswalk and creates potential conflicts. Parking lot pavement markings are non-standard and do not provide adequate width to safely direct children/parents from the school to the school’s exit. The potential for conflict is magnified when a car wants to turn right (i.e., north on Catala Ave.). The same narrow passageway becomes additionally hazardous for children crossing the street. Current crosswalk configurations direct pedestrians into the concrete ramp accessing the school parking lot. Children waiting to cross the street are waiting on a vehicle ramp, not on a sidewalk with an ADA compliant ramp. A separate pedestrian gate is available, but it includes a ramp with several switchbacks, making it appear inconvenient for most pedestrians. Enforcement is an issue. Presently, parking lot access is restricted to special education and private before/after school buses. A temporary sign at the parking lot entrance notifies parents of the restricted access. The audit found cars disregarding the sign. Because all the students must pass through the parking lot to exit the school, restricting/limiting vehicle access is a top priority.

Opportunities
Highlands Elementary School has one entrance, unlike other elementary schools that can have several access points. This allows staff to focus safety and observation efforts at the front of the school. Highlands has a crossing guard at the intersection of Empino Ln. and Catala Ave. The crossing guard works during both arrival and dismissal. Parking space for parents to wait for their children is limited due to the street layout. This encourages parents who drive their children to park further from the school to avoid traffic conflicts.

Biking
Bicycling to Highlands Elementary School could be difficult for some children, due to the topography. Students south of the school would have to bike uphill to get to school, while those living north of the school would have to bike uphill to get home. There are bicycle racks at the school that accommodate about 15 bicycles. Children are permitted to bicycle to school once they enter the 3rd grade. Children who bicycle to school are required to sign a permission form with a parent, bring a lock, and wear a helmet.

Specific Location Notes and Potential Solutions
Below are potential solutions identified during the audit. Recommended improvements are shown in Figure 8-3.

- The crosswalk along Catala Ave. could be shifted north several feet to redirect pedestrian traffic away from the vehicle entrance of the school; more prominent/direct crosswalks and pavement signage in parking lot.
- Create a separate/more direct entrance for pedestrians on the north side of the vehicle entrance.
- Install permanent/high visibility signage on Catala and Empino.
Figure 8-3: Highlands Elementary School Recommended Improvements

- Remove North Crosswalk and Pedestrian Path
- Paint Pedestrian Path
- Construct Ramp
- Existing Gate Access
- (crosswalk completed in 2007)
8.4.4. McGrath Elementary School

Concerns
McGrath Elementary School has one main entrance, accessing the school south from Deputy Jake Dr. As expected, one access point to the school creates a natural bottleneck of pedestrian and car activity. There is limited waiting room for the parents wishing to pick up their children, as they are encouraged to wait at the top of the walking ramp. At the entrance, the combination of cars waiting in line to enter the valet, parents parking and walking their kids, and children walking makes for a hectic atmosphere. Greater enforcement and parental responsibility would help conditions.

Opportunities
McGrath Elementary has mastered the valet system. Because of the parking lot layout, McGrath has enough room to implement two valet lines – a regular line and an “express line.” The express valet is located on the island just north of the school sidewalk. Students are recommended by teachers, and then are required to have a parent signed consent form. The express valet moves about twice as fast as the other valet lines, so parents are greatly encouraged to participate, based on their children’s conduct at school. School boundaries include a significant amount of multi-family apartments that has increased the amount of children walking to school.

Biking
Staff indicated that some families in the McGrath area may not be able to afford bicycles, which may make bicycling difficult for children. One student was observed bringing a bike to school, but it is not a common occurrence (according to Principal Heath).

Specific Location Notes and Potential Solutions
Listed below are potential solutions identified during the walk audit. Recommended improvements are shown in Figure 8-4.

- There are two crossing guards at the intersection of Deputy Jake Dr. and Valle del Oro. While they are utilized now, there may be an additional need for crossing guards when Deputy Jake Dr. extends further west and connects with the Santa Clarita road network.
- McGrath is a model school for staff involvement during dismissal. All staff is required to participate, and it is evident in the efficiency of the valet program.
- Beyond the Valet – the sidewalk at the top of the pedestrian walkway becomes crowded with students, waiting parents, and staff. A concrete pad as a staging/waiting area could be beneficial as there are reports of students having to go into the streets to get through the crowds of waiting parents.
- McGrath should be used as a model for their valet, and for staff involvement.
Figure 8-4: McGrath Elementary School Recommended Improvements

- Additional crossing guards on Deputy Jake Dr with extension of the street to the west
- Construct concrete waiting pad at terminus of pedestrian path
- Implement two valet lines
8.4.5. Wiley Canyon Elementary School

Concerns
There are three separate access points for children to enter/exit the school. School staff is concerned about the multiple access points, particularly during dismissal time. Students walking home from school exit at the north side of campus onto La Glorita through a pedestrian gate. La Glorita is heavily used during pick-up/drop-off and is frequently lined with cars parked on both sides of the street. On the north side of La Glorita is a large apartment complex that prohibits unauthorized parking. Unauthorized parking severely restricts motorist visibility along La Glorita. This conflict is magnified by La Glorita being the primary access point of children walking to/from school.

Wiley Canyon has an efficient valet system. Despite the valet, traffic backs up in both directions on Wiley Canyon Rd. (a secondary arterial) in preparation for the valet to begin. Parents disregard parking restrictions on school property and along Wiley Canyon Rd.

Vehicles making a left turn into the staff parking lot (for the valet pick-up lane) also back-up and queue along the middle lane along Wiley Canyon Rd. Local police have given tickets to vehicles “parked” along the middle lane waiting to make a left turn into the staff parking lot. In addition, motorists waiting to make the left turn block vehicles trying to turn left out of the lot. A primary obstacle for biking/walking children is Wiley Canyon Rd. As an arterial street, it can be an uninviting and intimidating barrier to families and young children.

Opportunities
Wiley Canyon has crossing guards to help children cross Wiley Canyon Rd. Bicycle racks allow children to park their bike while at school. There is a significant amount of housing in close proximity to Wiley Canyon, making it possible for many more children to be currently walking and biking to school.

Biking
There are two bicycle racks at Wiley Canyon, each with an approximate 10-bike capacity. Children in grades 3+ are permitted to ride their bike to school with a helmet and lock. Principal Yannich reports that a handful of children currently ride their bike to school and about 20% of children walk to school. Scooters are not permitted.

Specific Location Notes and Potential Solutions

Listed below are potential solutions identified during the walk audit. Recommended improvements are shown in Figure 8-5.

- High visibility crosswalk at Wiley Canyon Rd. and La Glorita Cir.
- Bulb-out at north valet entrance – south of Wiley Canyon/La Glorita intersection.
- Enhanced traffic enforcement could be beneficial.
- Curb or post needed in valet area.
- Right turn only striping and signage at the south school driveway (exit driveway) could help with queuing.
Figure 8-5: Wiley Canyon Elementary School Recommended Improvements

- Restripe to be 1 Right-Turn Lane
- Install "Right-Turn Only" Sign
- Strip Channelizer into 1 Lane
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8.5. Junior High and High School Notes

In addition to the seven remaining elementary schools in the previous section, the City has plans to apply for funding for junior high and high schools within Santa Clarita. The high schools include Canyon, Golden Valley, Hart, Saugus, and Valencia. The junior high schools include Arroyo Seco, La Mesa, Placerita, Rio Norte, and Sierra Vista. Interviews with staff from each school were conducted to determine existing non-motorized mode share to school, identify barriers to walking and biking in the school vicinity, and evaluate existing levels of programmatic efforts. Only a subset of these schools was available for interviews. The following schools did not participate:

- Canyon High School
- Saugus High School
- La Mesa Junior High School
- Rio Norte Junior High School

8.5.1. Golden Valley High School

At Golden Valley High School, approximately 50 percent of children walk or bike to school, the majority of which walk. Barriers to children walking and biking to school include Sierra Highway and Golden Valley, as these streets are commuter roads with high volumes of vehicles.

Busses drop students off far from the school, requiring them to walk approximately 15 to 20 minutes into the campus and walk along/across the aforementioned roads.

Existing crosswalks are narrow and do not have the capacity to accommodate the volumes of children using them.

The school does not currently provide any bicycle/pedestrian education or encouragement programs.

8.5.2. Hart High School

No more than 25 percent of students use non-motorized transportation to get to Hart High School. At arrival and dismissal times, there are high vehicle volumes on Newhall Ave. The circular drive at the front of the school also can be very congested with vehicles and students at these times. The principal noted that the crosswalk at Newhall Ave. and 14th St. is in need of safety enhancements.

The school has a limited number of bike racks available because of a lack of available locations to place and secure them.

The school does not have any existing bicycle/pedestrian education or encouragement programs.
8.5.3. Valencia High School
Less than five percent of students walk or bike to Valencia High School as many live far from the campus. However, there has been a recent increase in biking, and the school has had to install additional bicycle parking. The long distances of residences away from the school act as a barrier to using non-motorized transportation.

Congestion before and after school on Decoro and Newhall Ranch make it challenging for bicyclists.

The school has no existing programs.

8.5.4. Arroyo Seco Junior High
The principal of Arroyo Seco Junior High noted that most students are driven to school. Parents pick up and drop off children a block away to avoid traffic, and start lining up early, which causes congestion around the school. Transit vehicles and buses for school programs contribute to the congestion. Poor driver behavior is another barrier to children walking and biking to school.

The school has narrow sidewalks, which cannot handle large volumes of pedestrians, specifically at the crossing guard location. Students form packs at the corner to wait to cross and because the sidewalks are not wide enough; they wait in the street.

Several sites are potentially hazardous to students walking and biking. Las Mananitas at Vista del Gato has a stop sign, but lacks a crosswalk. There is a blind curve on Vista Del Gato approaching Decoro, and motorists drive fast. There is a crosswalk on Decoro after the blind curve.

Students are required to walk bikes on and off campus and must wear a helmet. There is no concrete enforcement, though a deputy threatens to write tickets to students not wearing helmets.

8.5.5. Placerita Junior High
The principal estimates that approximately 65 percent of students at Placerita walk to school every day. They utilize the traffic light on Orchard Village Rd. to cross the street and the existing paseos. Many students also bike to school via the paseos and the bridge over the Santa Clara River.

The most congested corner for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross is the intersection of Newhall Ave. and Dalbey Dr. There is a long line of parents in cars waiting to pick students up in the afternoons. However, school administrators stand at the crosswalk to assist.

The school participates in an annual bike to work/school day that the City of Santa Clarita publicizes.

8.5.6. Sierra Vista Junior High
Approximately 25 to 35 percent of students walk or bike to Sierra Vista Junior High. Traffic congestion and busy intersections are barriers to addition students using non-motorized transportation, as parents do not trust that their children will be safe.
Past collisions have occurred in the mornings at the intersection of Whites Canyon and Stillmore. To avoid this location, some parents ask their students to walk to one of the strip mall areas to be picked up there.

The school does not have any existing programs for students. However, sometimes staff members participate in a bike to school (work) day.

8.6. **Next Steps**

After adoption of this plan, the City should take the following steps in improving walking and biking to schools:

- Implement outstanding improvements for which funding has been secured.
- Conduct walk audits and improvement plans for junior high and high schools, and Golden Oak Community School.
- Continue applying for Safe Routes to School grants, including a grant to expand the education and encouragement program to all schools.
- Construct improvements.
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9. COMPLETE STREETS

9.1. Introduction

A complete street provides for safe, convenient, and comfortable travel by foot, bicycle, public transit, and personal vehicle. Complete streets are designed for access, mobility, and safety for all users, regardless of travel mode. They provide for automobiles while enabling and encouraging transit, walking, and biking. Complete streets are an important element in improving bicyclist and pedestrian safety, and making walking and biking easier and more pleasant.

Complete streets designs take into account a jurisdiction’s unique setting and roadway conditions. Depending on the context, complete streets designs can look very different among locations and can be implemented in various ways. Some of the common elements of complete street designs include:

- Pedestrian infrastructure: Sidewalks, crosswalks, and paseos
- Bicycle infrastructure: Bike lanes and bike parking
- Coordinated transit facilities: Bus pull-outs or transit right of way
- Aesthetic and safety improvements: Landscaping, contrasting pavement colors and signage

There are many benefits of implementing complete streets. By providing walking, biking, and transit facilities, people are encouraged to commute through active transportation, thus increasing physical activity and countering the nationwide obesity epidemic. Complete streets can improve safety by reducing conflicts between users and calming traffic. Providing alternatives to driving can have a profound environmental impact by reducing vehicle emissions. In addition, complete streets have the potential to improve the economy by encouraging residents and visitors to linger in shops and restaurants. Complete streets can provide transportation options for community members who cannot drive: the elderly, students, people with disabilities, and people who cannot afford a car.

9.2. Policy Background

In the past, most transportation infrastructure in the United States has been designed to meet the needs of drivers: streets are wide, speeds are high, intersections are large, and parking is abundant. As an unintended consequence, walking, riding transit, and bicycling are less pleasant, less convenient, and often, less safe. Most cities’ policies and design standards still reflect this older way of thinking. Revising policies and standards to reflect complete streets concepts makes it more likely that public agencies will incorporate the needs of all road users into new projects and roadway retrofits.

Recognizing the importance of incorporating complete streets policies into local governance, the California legislature passed the Complete Streets Bill in 2008 (Assembly Bill 1358). As of January 1, 2011, California cities and counties are required to include provisions for the accommodation of all roadway users when updating the part of a local plan that governs traffic flow, per California Government Code §65302:

(2) (A) Commencing January 1, 2011, upon any substantive revisions of the circulation element, the legislative body shall modify the circulation element to plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context of the general plan. (B) For purposes of
In 2010, Caltrans published a revised version of Deputy Directive 64, which explicitly states that complete streets policies shall be considered in all phases of state-owned roadway planning, design, construction, maintenance, and repair.

9.3. Objective

The objective of this policy is to establish guiding principles and practices so transportation improvements are planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use while promoting safe operations for all users.

The City of Santa Clarita will create a safe and efficient transportation system that promotes the health and mobility of all Santa Clarita citizens and visitors by providing high quality pedestrian, bicycling, and transit access to all destinations throughout the City. The City of Santa Clarita will provide for the needs of drivers, transit users, bicyclists, and pedestrians of all ages and abilities in all planning, design, construction, reconstruction, retrofit, operations, and maintenance activities and products.

The City of Santa Clarita will enhance the safety, access, convenience, and comfort of all users of all ages and abilities. The City understands that children, seniors, and persons with disabilities may require special accommodations.

9.4. Street Network/Connectivity

A. The City of Santa Clarita will design, operate and maintain a transportation network that provides a connected network of facilities accommodating all modes of travel.

B. The City will actively look for opportunities to repurpose rights-of-way to enhance connectivity for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit.

C. The City will focus non-motorized connectivity improvements to services, schools, parks, civic uses, regional connections and commercial uses.

D. The City will require new developments to provide interconnected networks for all modes.

9.5. Jurisdiction

A. This Complete Street Policy is intended to cover all development and redevelopment in the public domain and all street improvement assessment districts with Santa Clarita, but will also focus on regional connectivity.

B. The City will require all developers and builders to obtain and comply with this policy.

C. The City will encourage agencies not under Santa Clarita’s jurisdiction, including, but not limited to local school districts, to work with the City to implement this policy.

D. The City will work closely with Los Angeles County, the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, the Southern California Regional Rail Authority, and the Southern California Association of Governments to encourage compliance with this policy.
9. Complete Streets

9.6. Phases

The City of Santa Clarita will apply this Complete Streets Policy to all roadway projects, including those involving new construction, reconstruction, retrofits, repaving, rehabilitation, or changes in the allocation of pavement space on an existing roadway, as well as those that involve new privately built roads and easements intended for public use. Complete Streets may be achieved through single projects or incrementally through a series of smaller improvements or maintenance and operation activities over time.

9.7. Design

A. Provide well-designed pedestrian accommodations on all streets and crossings. Pedestrian accommodations can take numerous forms, including but not limited to traffic signals, roundabouts, bulb-outs, extensions, sidewalks, buffer zones, shared-use pathways, and perpendicular curb ramps, among others.

B. Provide well-designed bicycle accommodations along all streets. Bicycle accommodations can take numerous forms, including but not limited to the use of bicycle boulevards, striping, slow streets, low auto-volume streets, traffic calming, signs, and pavement markings, among others.

C. Where physical conditions warrant, landscaping shall be planted whenever a street is newly constructed, reconstructed, or relocated, to provide a buffer between the vehicular travelled way and adjacent pedestrian facilities.

9.8. Context Sensitivity

A. The City of Santa Clarita will plan its streets in harmony with the adjacent land uses and neighborhoods.

B. The City will solicit input from local stakeholders during the planning process.

C. The City will integrate natural features, such as waterways, and other topography into design of streets.

D. The City will design streets with a strong sense of place. Architecture, landscaping, streetscaping, public art, signage, etc. will be used to reflect the community and neighborhood.

E. The City will coordinate street improvements with merchants and along retail and commercial corridors to develop vibrant and livable streets.

F. The City will practice sustainable storm water management practices.

9.9. Implementation

After adoption, effective implementation of the Complete Streets Policy will require additional steps to ensure success. The City of Santa Clarita will need to review their procedures and, if necessary, restructure them, to accommodate all users on every project. The City of Santa Clarita will incorporate Complete Streets principles into the following documents as they are updated: the City of Santa Clarita General Plan, City of Santa Clarita Municipal Code, and other plans, manuals, rules, regulations and programs as appropriate.

In addition, applicable changes to design manuals or public works standards will need to be made to fully encompass the safety and needs of all users by employing the latest in design standards and innovation. Periodic education and training of planners and engineers is also recommended to ensure the latest techniques in balancing the needs of
roadway users are being applied. Finally existing data sources and projects can be tapped to track how well the streets are serving all users.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Public Works Department will be responsible for the implementation of this Complete Streets Policy.

9.10. Exceptions

Complete Street principles and practices will be included in street construction, reconstruction, repaving, and rehabilitation projects, as well as other plans and manuals, except under one or more of the following conditions:

A. A project involves only ordinary or emergency maintenance activities designed to keep assets in serviceable conditions such as mowing, cleaning, sweeping, spot repair, concrete joint repair, or pothole filling, or when interim measures are implemented on temporary detour or haul routes.

B. The City Council exempts a project due to excessive and disproportionate cost of establishing a bikeway, walkway or transit enhancement as part of a project.

C. The Director of Public Works and the Director of Community Development jointly determine the construction is not practically feasible or cost effective because of significant or adverse environmental impacts to waterways, flood plains, remnants of native vegetation, wetlands, or other critical areas, or due to impacts on neighboring land uses, including impact from right of way acquisitions.

D. Where absence of need exists, including absence of future need.

E. Where the City Engineer issues a documented exception concluding that the application of Complete Streets principles is unnecessary or inappropriate because it would be contrary to public safety.

F. Where the existing right of way does not allow for the accommodation of all users. In this case, alternatives shall be explored such as the use of revised travel lane configurations, paved shoulders, signage, traffic calming, education or enforcement to accommodate pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and persons with disabilities.

G. The Director of Public Works and the Director of Community Development jointly determine it is not practically feasible or cost effective to implement the provisions of this policy through public or private project design or manuals or other plans.

Exceptions described above, will be documented.