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Implementation Strategy

- New Bicycle Issues and Ideas (BAC, CAC, staff, public)
- BAPP Recommendations
  - Screening & Project Development
  - Capital Projects

Plans

- Fundraising
- System Wide Plans & Programs
- Prioritization
- Feasibility Studies
- Caltrain-led Bike Projects
- Externally-led Bike Projects

Implementation

Monitoring & Reporting

Project Review

Focus on Caltrain-led Bicycle Projects
Prioritization Discussion
Caltrain-led Bike Projects

Input from Subcommittee

- Prioritization approach should be useful beyond this specific project list
- Explicitly incorporate customer feedback / complaints / incident reports
- Consider project readiness
- Is project a convenience or necessity?
- Think about weighting criteria
Proposed Prioritization Criteria

- One set of criteria for all projects
- 12 possible points
- Points grouped into 4 broad categories
  - Project Support (2 possible)
  - Project Funding (2 possible)
  - Project Readiness (2 possible)
  - Project Need & Effectiveness (6 possible)
- Projects subject to individual grant eligibility
- Prioritized list becomes BAC recommendation informing agency CIP

Example Scoring – Sunnyvale Bike Lockers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referenced in plan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Santa Clara Countywide Bicycle Plan (2008) “Recommended Bike Parking Projects: eLockers at all Park &amp; Ride lots and Transit Centers Bike stations at all transit stations with demand exceeding 70 bikes per day.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To be determined based on future discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To be determined based on future discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>To be determined based on future discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feasible</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project is known to be feasible at proposed location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shovel-ready</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bike lockers are ready for procurement and installation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Example Scoring continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency &amp; convenience</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project will allow more efficient usage of bike lockers and will increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>convenience and ease of use for cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety / security</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Project will increase availability and use of secure bike parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodates net new cyclists</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Total physical supply of parking will remain the same. Currently, spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in reserved lockers are still available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User Input</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>TBD</strong></td>
<td>To be determined based on review of correspondence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 5 station</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Sunnyvale is #6 in cyclist boardings (2013 data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 10 station</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sunnyvale is #6 in cyclist boardings (2013 data)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Prioritization Discussion

**Feasibility Studies**
Feasibility Studies: Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Staff Recommended Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PL01 – Discounted Locker Rentals</td>
<td>Examine issue as one element in planned “Bike Parking Business Plan.” Do not pursue as an independent study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL02 – Bikeshare Study</td>
<td>Scope written into 2008 plan no longer applicable. Postpone further action until current Bay Area Bike Share contract is taken over and program reviewed by MTC (early 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL03 – Folding Bike Promotion</td>
<td>Do not pursue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PL04 – Bike Car Capacity Information | Refine and expand scope. Key questions include:  
  - Desired system performance and outcomes  
  - Range of technology options  
  - Agency operational and resource constraints  
  - Applicability of possible systems to both current trains and future EMUs |

Funding Analysis
Funding Need to Complete BAPP
(Preliminary $ estimates – updated May 2014)

- Funding need estimate for 10 stations included in 2008 BAPP
- Includes only costs for projects specifically recommended in 2008 BAPP
- Does not include O&M costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Category</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>San Mateo</th>
<th>Santa Clara</th>
<th>System-wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bike Parking</td>
<td>$515,000</td>
<td>$544,000</td>
<td>$1,087,000</td>
<td>$2,146,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Access</td>
<td>$225,000</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Information</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Safety</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Feasibility Studies</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost</td>
<td>$760,000</td>
<td>$1,214,000</td>
<td>$1,152,000</td>
<td>$3,351,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding Challenge & Strategy

- Funding limited
- Staff / administrative capacity limited
- Implementation driven by grant availability
- Utilize local funds to leverage grants
- Grant constraints
  - Grants have different eligibility requirements
  - Some projects do not meet eligibility or may not be competitive on their own
- Match grant sources and eligible projects to maximize overall project delivery
5-year Funding Scenarios

$0  $0.8  $2.7  $3.4

(millions of dollars)

Conservative Approach
- Only pursue grants with high probability of success
- Focus on only highest scoring projects
- Assume modest level of help and participation from partners and cities

Aggressive Approach
- Pursue grants broadly and work to make projects competitive
- Try to complete a larger spectrum of projects
- Assume significant level of help and participation from partners and cities

Estimated total BAPP project cost

Next Steps
- Take strategy to CAC and Board as informational item (June – early July)
- Develop implementation process
- Return to BAC in July with Draft Plan
- Ongoing discussions with funding partners and county Congestion Management Agencies