

CORRIDOR EVALUATION OC Foothills Bikeways Collaborative

Lower Higher

	Safety Needs	Public Support	Trip Demand	Ease of Implementation	Bikeway Completion	Cost per Benefit	Disadvantaged Areas	Avoids Steep Hills
Corridor A			OOOO	OOOO		$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	OOOO	OOOO
Corridor B								$\bigcirc \bigcirc $
Corridor C			$\bigcirc \bigcirc $				\mathbf{O}	\mathbf{O}
Corridor D	\mathbf{O}	$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$			OOOO		\mathbf{O}	\mathbf{O}
Corridor E		$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$						$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$
Corridor F	\mathbf{O}		$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	OOOO	$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$
Corridor G	\mathbf{O}		$\bigcirc \bigcirc $		\mathbf{O}		\mathbf{OOOO}	\mathbf{O}
Corridor H								
Corridor I	\mathbf{O}			$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	\mathbf{O}	$\bigcirc \bigcirc $	\mathbf{O}	\mathbf{O}
Corridor J							$\bigcirc \bigcirc $	$\bigcirc \bigcirc $
Corridor K		$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	OOOOO			$\bigcirc \bigcirc $	$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$	$\mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O} \mathbf{O}$

	Safety Needs	Public Support	Trip Demand	Ease of Implementation	Bikeway Completion	Cost per Benefit	Disadvantaged Areas	Avoids Steep Hills
	D, E, F	B , F	G, J	D, E	B , J	D, E	D, G	D
	A, B, C, G, I, J, K	A, C	B, E	B , K	A, C, G	H, J	B, E	C, G, H, I
	Н	G , I	D, I	G, J	Е, Н	B, C	С, Н	
		Н, Ј	С, Н	С, Н	I, K	G , I	I, J	B , J
\bigcirc		D, E, K	A, F, K	A, F, I	D, F	A, F, K	A, F, K	A, E, F, K

FEHR PEERS



Orange County Foothills Bikeways Collaborative



Evaluation Method

Each of the regional priority bikeway corridors identified in the OC Foothills area were evaluated using the criteria below:

1. Safety Factors - Collisions: examines historic crash data for the corridor. Level of Traffic Stress: addresses perceived safety related to posted traffic speeds, traffic volumes and existing bikeway type. High stress routes are prioritized for treatment.

2. Public support: incorporates public priorities through a Public Demand Index. A combination of "votes" from the survey and public roundtable events were used as inputs.

3. Trip Demand: based on the OCTA Bicycle Priority Index (BPI), a measure of population and employment density, land use, local schools and transit that influences usage.

4. Constraints: tallies physical constraints such as right-of-way, on-street parking, and other 'chokepoints.' Higher scoring corridors are considered easier to implement and therefore prioritized for treatment.

5. Bikeway completion: measures the potential to 'complete' a longer corridor and completion of the regional network.

6. Economic Efficiency: measures the financial benefits associated with the corridor, considering the number of anticipated users compared to construction cost estimates.

7. Grades: measures how steep roadways are to help riders determine preferable routes.

8. Equity: measures a route's ability to provide transportation options to socially disadvantaged areas



Figure 1: Bikeway Completion









Figure 3: Trip Demand

Figure 4: Collisions

BICYCLE FACILITY TYPES



CLASS I SHARED USE PATH



CLASS II BIKE LANE



CLASS III BICYCLE BOULEVARD

the cycle track shall be scheme and the scheme and

CLASS IV BUFFERED BIKE LANE

On-Street Marked Bikeway Continuum

Bike

Lane

least protected

most protected

Shared Lane Markings

Shoulder Bikeway Buffered Bike Lane

Cycle Track: Oneor two-way, atgrade_protected Cycle Track: Oneor two-way, raised with mountable Cycle Track: Oneor two-way, curb separated

				grade, protected	with mountable	, cui biseparateu
				with parking	Mountable curb should have 4:1 slope edge	
Potential placement zone*						
Travel Lane Side- Walk Travel	ane Shoulder Trave	vel Lane , Lane , Walk	Travel Lane , Lane , Walk	Parking Lane , Bike , Side- Lane , Walk	Bike Side- Travel Lane Walk	Travel Lane , Lane , Walk
TYPICAL APPLICATION Additional ROW*: None Traffic Volume: <= 3,000 ADT Traffic Speed: <= 30 mph Context: Urban/Suburban Traffic Context	T APPLICATION T nal ROW*: 12' Add plume: <= 10,000 Trai Trai peed: No Restriction Cor : Rural	TYPICAL APPLICATION Iditional ROW*: 8'- 14' affic Volume: >= 3,000 ADT affic Speed: >= 25mph ontext: Urban, Suburban, Rural	TYPICAL APPLICATION Additional ROW*: 14' - 20' Traffic Volume: >= 10,000 ADT Traffic Speed: >= 25mph Context: Urban, Suburban, Rural	TYPICAL APPLICATION Additional ROW*: 14' - 20' Traffic Volume: >= 10,000 ADT Traffic Speed: >= 40mph Context: Urban/Suburban	TYPICAL APPLICATION Additional ROW*: 13'- 17' Traffic Volume: >= 10,000 ADT Traffic Speed: >= 40mph Context: Urban/Suburban	TYPICAL APPLICATION Additional ROW*: 12'- 14' Traffic Volume: >= 10,000 ADT Traffic Speed: >= 40mph Context: Urban/Suburban







ALAMITOS

SEAL BEACH



Increasing Transportation Choices



Context Sensitive Design





Source: OCTA

Active Transportation