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1. Purpose, Goals & Objectives

The Comprehensive Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan (CPBP) was developed by the City of Belmont for adoption as part of the City’s General Plan Circulation Element. The City was awarded a grant by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) for development of the CPBP.

Document Overview

The CPBP is divided into the following sections:

1. **Purpose, Goals & Objectives** are described in Chapter 1. Key goals of the plan are to support related efforts to increase the rate of walking and bicycling and support adopted policies aimed at providing complete streets.

2. **Existing Conditions** for walking and bicycling in Belmont are summarized in Chapter 2. The existing conditions assessment is based on an inventory of current citywide pedestrian and bicycle facilities, land use and travel destinations, and travel data.

3. **Community Input & Key Needs** for achieving the plan goals and objectives are described in Chapter 3. Key deficiencies and recommended priority improvement locations are identified, based on the existing conditions review, review of safety data, and community input, including an online resident survey and meetings with the City’s stakeholder advisory group (SAG).

4. **Proposed Citywide Network & Priority Improvements** are presented in Chapter 4. The recommended long-term (Year 2035) vision aims at achieving plan goals and objectives that aim to reduce gaps in the citywide pedestrian network and provide a continuous citywide network of bikeways.

5. **Recommended Implementation & Phasing Program** for achieving the plan goals and objectives is detailed in Chapter 5, including estimated costs of capital improvements and recommended phasing of improvements in five year increments.

Bicycling and walking tours were held in January 2016 to seek input and gauge community support, as described in Chapter 3.
Purpose of the Plan

The CPBP was prepared in order to:

- Support adopted citywide, regional and State goals related to the provision of complete streets, and assist in implementing the City’s Complete Streets Policy (CSP) adopted in January 2013.
- Assess pedestrian and bicycle conditions on a citywide basis
- Identify key deficiencies and prioritize projects where safety and mode switch are encouraged.
- Guide the City’s future investments in pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- Provide the City with a strategic resource that aids in developing citywide pedestrian and bicycle networks.
- Employ a strategic approach for improving non-motorized transportation in Belmont.

The CPBP is consistent with the San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan (Countywide Plan) adopted in 2011, the CCAG Congestion Management Plan prepared in 2011, the Belmont-Redwood Shores Safe Routes to School Study prepared in 2012, and the Ralston Corridor Study approved in August 2014.

Benefits of Active Transportation

Providing infrastructure and urban design amenities to create integrated transportation networks that include walkable and bikeable streets and neighborhoods produces multiple benefits to cities worldwide, including:

- **Enhanced mobility:** Most daily trips in most communities, including Belmont, are within bicycling or walking distances, including local trips to shopping, schools, local services, parks and public transit. Provision of a complete street network and elimination of barriers to walking and bicycling, including provisions for transit access will result in increased transportation options for all age groups.
- **Improved public health:** Rates of obesity and other public health risks associated with reduced physical activity increased dramatically in recent decades, for children as well as adults. Provision of active transportation networks is increasingly identified as a recommended component of local public health programs.
- **Reduction in greenhouse gas emissions:** Successful investments in walking and bicycling lead to reductions in local greenhouse gas emissions.
- **Increased property values.** Bikeable and walkable neighborhoods help to attract and retain a talented and youthful workforce. ¹
- **More retail dollars spent at local businesses.** Studies in other cities have found that residents who walk and bike to visit local businesses spend more money than customers that drive. ²

---

Goals & Objectives

This section describes the plan goals and objectives.

Goals

The identified goals of the CPBP are to:

- **GOAL 1**: Create a safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle friendly environment that will encourage people of all ages to bike or walk.
- **GOAL 2**: Increase the rate of walking and bicycling in Belmont.
- **GOAL 3**: Promote multimodal transportation infrastructure that accommodates all users.
- **GOAL 4**: Support adopted citywide, regional, and State goals related to the provision of complete streets.
- **GOAL 5**: Provide a continuous network of pedestrian facilities that connects neighborhoods with key destinations and transit stops.
- **GOAL 6**: Support the development of a citywide bicycle network.
Objectives

Based on the plan goals identified above, and incorporating the review of existing conditions, community input and the needs assessment described in Chapters 2 to 4, the following measurable objectives are proposed for adoption as part of the CPBP:

- **OBJECTIVE 1:** Double the rate of walking and bicycling in Belmont by 2030.

  Based on U.S. Census data, the current rate of bicycling and walking for trips to/from work is 2% (1% walk and 1% bicycle), roughly half the San Mateo Countywide rate of 4% (3% walk and 1% bicycle). The Census report does not provide data on non-work trips or school trips, but nonetheless provides a benchmark for future comparison.

- **OBJECTIVE 2:** Reduce pedestrian network gaps by providing continuous sidewalks on (1) at least one side of most arterial and collector streets by 2030; and (2) at least one side of local streets that provide access to schools, parks, employment locations, and transit stops by 2030.

  Based on the community survey, members of the public identified pedestrian network gaps as the single biggest constraint to walking in Belmont.

- **OBJECTIVE 3:** Provide bicycle facilities on most segments of Belmont’s 21-mile network of arterial and collector streets by 2030, including Class II bicycle lanes on at least half of the City’s 11-mile arterial street network.

  Belmont’s existing bikeway network consists of approximately six miles of bikeway facilities (including 2.3 miles of Class II bikeway segments).

- **OBJECTIVE 4:** Provide site-specific pedestrian and bicycle crossing enhancements wherever feasible at locations where pedestrian priority routes and bikeway corridors intersect arterial and collector streets, and at locations where such enhancements would reduce walking distance to adjacent school and transit stops.

- **OBJECTIVE 5:** Increase the provision of secure bicycle parking, particularly within Downtown, at major parks and civic facilities, and consider updating zoning ordinance parking requirements to include bicycle-parking standards for non-residential development by 2021.

- **OBJECTIVE 6:** Reduce the number of pedestrian and bicycle collisions by 50% by 2025.

  Some cities have also adopted a “Vision Zero” goal, aimed at achieving zero traffic-related fatalities, applied to all travel modes. The City could consider such a goal as part of the General Plan update.

- **OBJECTIVE 7:** Incorporate complete streets performance measures when evaluating transportation impacts and/or considering changes to the transportation network.

The objective aims to nearly double the size of the bikeway network, and increase the provision of bicycle lanes to more than 5.5 miles.
Policy & Planning Context

This section summarizes relevant policies and planning efforts in Belmont associated with future transportation improvements. Documents considered for development of the CPBP include the Belmont General Plan, Complete Streets Policy of City of Belmont, San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan, and relevant transportation infrastructure policies and studies.

Belmont 2035 General Plan

Concurrent with development of this CPBP, the Belmont General Plan is also being updated for the horizon year of 2035. The General Plan is a governing document and upon completion, should be referred to before implementing pedestrian or bicycle project improvements identified in the CPBP. From the Draft General Plan Update, Belmont Village Circulation Element Section 3.2 Policy Framework, the following is a list of policies Belmont is striving to implement in regards to pedestrian and bicycle transportation:

- Create and maintain a transportation system that is safe, efficient, provides access in an equitable manner, and optimizes travel by all modes. Acknowledge that a “whole network approach” is necessary, because all streets cannot necessarily serve all users at all times.
- Establish a well-integrated network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities to accommodate safe, convenient, practical, and inviting travel by walking and bicycling.
- Identify additional strategies to reduce congestion, enhance operations, and improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety along Ralston Avenue, building on the recommendations in the Ralston Avenue Corridor Study.
- Incorporate the Alameda de las Pulgas Corridor Study, Four Corners and Ralston Avenue Corridor Study recommendations. More specific improvements will be studied and recommended in the Belmont Village PDA Specific Plan as they pertain to that area.
- Work collaboratively with the school districts (Belmont-Redwood Shores and Sequoia Union High) to address congestion associated with school trips, minimize neighborhood conflicts, and foster safe multimodal transportation options for students (Safe Routes to Schools).

Belmont Complete Streets Policy

The City of Belmont committed to creating and maintaining Complete Streets that provide safe, comfortable, and convenient travel in 2013 through adoption of a CSP. As defined in the California Complete Streets Act of 2008, Complete Streets are streets that are designed to allow safe and convenient travel for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, and transit users.

In addition, Complete Streets assist in reducing greenhouse gas emissions mandated by State laws (known as AB 32 and AB 375). Annually, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) allocate federal and grant funds to the region through the One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program to support streets, highways, mass transit, non-vehicular access and other infrastructure. To receive funding through the OBAG program, jurisdictions must update their General Plan and adopt policies consistent with the Complete Streets Act.
Belmont’s adopted CSP discusses the importance of Complete Streets and establishes guiding principles so that transportation improvements are planned, designed, constructed, operated and maintained to encourage walking, bicycling and transit while providing safe operations. Development of the CPBP is one part of the City’s strategy for implementing the CSP.

**Belmont Village Specific Plan**

The Specific Plan is being developed concurrently with this CPBP and the Existing Conditions Circulation element was completed in October 2015. Belmont Village is designated a Priority Development Area (PDA) by the MTC and Association of Bay Area Governments due to its potential to support new housing and employment in close proximity to public transit. The goal of the Specific Plan is to formalize a vision for Belmont Village, the downtown area of Belmont. The Plan also aims at developing an implementation program through zoning regulations, public realm improvements, and design guidelines for new developments.
1. Purpose, Goals & Objectives

San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle & Pedestrian Plan

The San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (Countywide Plan) was adopted in 2011 and provides a high-level overview of pedestrian and bicycle focuses for all cities in the county limits.

- Referencing the Plan, Belmont has pedestrian focus areas localized around El Camino Real, and some additional zones throughout the City (typically around school locations). The pedestrian focus areas define areas anticipated to need pedestrian improvements and provide a starting point for the development of pedestrian-related improvement recommendations from Belmont’s CPBP.

- The Countywide Plan also describes locations needing improvement to complete the planned Countywide Bicycle Network. In Belmont, four roadways are designated as Key Bicycle Corridors: Alameda de las Pulgas, El Camino Real, Old County Road, and Ralston Avenue.

Belmont-Redwood Shores Safe Routes to School Report

The Belmont-Redwood Shores Safe Routes to School Report prepared in March 2012 discusses recommendations for improvements in zones within close proximity to school campuses. The document provides information on each school within the Belmont-Redwood Shores School District along with associated recommendations resulting from the performed analyses. The recommendations pertain mainly to crossing facilities needed for school children to safely access their campuses and include, but are not limited to, enhanced crosswalk striping, crossing guard implementation, flashing beacons, and other supplemental pedestrian amenities. Appendix A contains school circulation maps displaying the commonly used routes for children attending each school.

Other Plans Under Development

In addition to the aforementioned plans and documents, many projects and plans are under development during the production of this CPBP including several studies conducted for the City of Belmont by W-Trans traffic engineering consultants. As of February 2016, bicycle infrastructure projects are in the planning stage on Alameda de las Pulgas (Four Corners Traffic Study), Old County Road (Old County Road Bike Lanes Project), and Ralston Avenue (Ralston Avenue Corridor Study).

The Belmont Village Parking Utilization Study (2013) documents recommendations to improve pedestrian safety in the Ralston Avenue and El Camino Real area, increase acceptable walking distance from parking to businesses, improve driving conditions, improve circulation of parking lots, and create responsible parking requirements for future development.
Public Outreach

Stakeholder Advisory Group

City staff identified representatives from schools, business groups, bicycle coalitions, and the community in the formation of a SAG. The SAG played an important role in the CPBP development, from reviewing deliverables to providing feedback to the project team as well as to garner support for the draft plan before presentation to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Committee (BPAC) and City Council. SAG members are listed on page 77 of the CPBP.

Community Survey

This CPBP incorporates responses from 144 community members to an online survey conducted in the early stages of development. The project team was responsible for drafting the survey and finalized after input from the SAG. The survey was made available to the public on the City’s website and advertised through community outreach efforts including flyers and emails. Survey results are summarized in Chapter 3.

Walk & Bike Tours

To seek input and gauge community support, the Walk and Bike Tours were held on January 24, 2016, as described in Chapter 3.
2. **Existing Conditions**

**Physical Setting & Environmental Context**

Belmont offers wooded hills, views of San Francisco Bay, and open space to the residential community located in San Mateo County on the San Francisco Peninsula. The City is approximately 4.6 square miles in size, and shares borders with the cities of San Mateo, San Carlos, Foster City and Redwood City. Highway 101 (US 101) and Interstate 280 (I-280) are north-south oriented freeways at the eastern and western limits of the City, respectively, and Highway 92 (SR 92) runs east-west through the City of San Mateo, approximately 2 miles north of Belmont. The City of Belmont takes pride in being unique, providing a small-town setting defining it as tranquil, safe, and alluring, while creating a strong sense of community by welcoming involvement from all residents. **Figure 2-1** provides a map showing Belmont’s regional location.

**Table 2-1: Belmont Residential Population by Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Range</th>
<th>2014 Estimate</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>5,750</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4,422</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>4,012</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>3,464</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 64</td>
<td>4,020</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,503</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population**

In 2014, Belmont’s residential population was estimated by the US Census Bureau to be approximately 26,503. Since 2010, the total population has grown by 4.4%. There is an approximate 51:49 ratio of female to male residents with roughly half the population falling into the age range of 25 to 54 years.

The most recent estimate from the US Census Bureau for households in Belmont is from 2014, which estimated the total number of households to be 10,493. Approximately 65% were family households with the remaining 35% representing nonfamily households. Approximately one-third of family households have children under the age of 18.

Belmont represents approximately 3.5% of the population in San Mateo County estimated at 739,837. There are 258,683 households countywide with a family-nonfamily ratio of 68:32 and one-third of family households have children under the age of 18, similar to Belmont. Countywide population has shown an increase of approximately 3.0%, which is lower than the growth observed in Belmont.
Figure 2-1: Regional Location Map
Land Uses & Travel Destinations

The City of Belmont is a predominantly residential community with commercial zoning primarily concentrated in the City’s easternmost quadrant that borders the key north-south transportation facilities, the Caltrain station or facility, El Camino Real and US 101 freeway, (serving Belmont and adjacent cities).

Figure 2-2 presents land use designations for the City of Belmont from the ongoing General Plan Update. Figure 2-3 shows the City’s designated neighborhood boundaries.

Commercial Destinations

Belmont’s commercial destinations are primarily concentrated near the Caltrain Station and adjacent properties near El Camino Real, Ralston Avenue, Old County Road and 6th Avenue. General/Highway Commercial locations are also located on both sides of US 101.

To the west of Belmont’s historic core, land uses are mainly comprised of residential, parks/open space, and public/institution uses such as schools. Relatively few commercial uses are located within the western part of Belmont aside from the neighborhood and office commercial zones near the intersection of Alameda de las Pulgas and Ralston Avenue.
2. Existing Conditions

School Destinations

As identified in **Table 2-2**, there are 14 schools within the City, primarily located west of Downtown, including seven schools located on just two streets, Ralston Avenue and Alameda del las Pulgas.

**Table 2-2: School Locations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carlmont High School</td>
<td>1400 Alameda de las Pulgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlmont Parents Nursery School</td>
<td>751 Alameda de las Pulgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Elementary School</td>
<td>525 Middle Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Armstrong School</td>
<td>1405 Solana Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cipriani Elementary School</td>
<td>2525 Buena Vista Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox Elementary School</td>
<td>3100 Saint James Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gloria Dei Lutheran Church &amp; School</td>
<td>2600 Ralston Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immaculate Heart of Mary Catholic School</td>
<td>1000 Alameda de las Pulgas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merry Moppet Preschool &amp; Belmont Oaks Academy</td>
<td>2200 Carlmont Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nesbit Elementary School</td>
<td>500 Biddulph Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame de Namur University</td>
<td>1500 Ralston Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame Elementary School</td>
<td>1200 Notre Dame Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame High School</td>
<td>1540 Ralston Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralston Middle School</td>
<td>2675 Ralston Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2-2: General Plan Land Use Map
Parks & Open Space Destinations

There are 23 public parks/open space locations as illustrated in Figure 2-3 within the City available for recreational activities:

1. **Alexander Park**: Located in Sterling Downs Neighborhood, this park offers basketball, tennis, horseshoe pits, barbeques, a lawn area, and playground.

2. **Barrett Community Center Park**: Located in Central Neighborhood, this park offers a ballfield, community garden, picnic area, recreational facility, soccer, basketball, playground, and stage area.

3. **Belameda Park**: Located in Western Hills Neighborhood, this park provides a playground and picnic area for visitors.

4. **Belmont Sports Complex**: Located at the northeast corner of the City, the Sports Complex provides baseball and soccer fields that are accessible via a pedestrian/bicycle bridge crossing US 101.

5. **Buckeye Picnic Area**: Located in Downtown, the picnic area offers a lawn, playground, barbeque, and rental facilities.

6. **Cipriani Park and Dog Park**: Located in Cipriani Neighborhood, this park offers a ballfield, multi-use field, playground, dog park, lawn area, and picnic area.

7. **College View Park**: Located in Central Neighborhood, this park provides a small lawn area and seating space.

8. **Crystal Springs Cross Country Course**: Located in Belmont Heights Neighborhood, this location provides a jogging track and access to open space trails through Water Dog Lake Park.

9. **Davey Glen Park**: Located in Central Neighborhood, Davey Glen Park is currently under development and Phase I plans are available on the City website.

10. **Hallmark Park**: Located in Belmont Hills Neighborhood, this park offers a jogging track, playground, and tennis courts.

11. **Hastings Tot Lot**: Located in Western Hills Neighborhood, this pocket park offers a playground for parents to bring their children.

12. **Hidden Canyon Park**: Located in Western Hills Neighborhood, this park offers a jogging track and access to open space trails through Water Dog Lake Park.

13. **McDougal Park**: Located in McDougal Neighborhood, this park offers basketball, a ballfield, multi-use field, picnic area, and playground.

14. **O’Donnell Park**: Located in Homeview Neighborhood, this park offers basketball, barbeques, a community garden, lawn area, playground, and picnic area.

15. **Patricia Wharton Park**: Located in Central Neighborhood, this corner park offers seating and sidewalk facilities for walking.

16. **Ralston Ranch Park**: Located in Plateau-Skymont Neighborhood, this park provides access to multi-use trails through the northern hills of the City.

17. **Redwood Picnic Area**: Located in Downtown, this area offers volleyball, horseshoe pits, barbeques, a picnic area and playground.

18. **San Juan Canyon**: Located in Plateau-Skymont Neighborhood, San Juan Canyon serves as the trailhead for paths through Laurelwood Park in the City of San Mateo.
19. **Semeria Park**: Located in Cipriani Neighborhood, this park offers a lawn area, picnic area, and playground.

20. **Twin Pines Meadow Picnic Area**: Located in Downtown, this area offers barbeques, a lawn area, picnic area, and stage area.

21. **Twin Pines Park**: Located in Downtown, this park offers open space trails, rental facilities, barbeques, a lawn area, playground, historical photo tour location, multi-use field, picnic area, recreational facility, and stage area.

22. **Wakefield Park**: Located in Belmont Heights Neighborhood, this park serves as a trailhead for walking and jogging trails through Water Dog Lake Park.

23. **Water Dog Lake Park**: Located between Belmont Heights Neighborhood and Western Hills Neighborhood, this park offers a multitude of open space trails for walking, jogging, hiking, and bicycling.

**Major Employers in San Mateo County**

Belmont is one of the smaller cities in San Mateo County and does not have large employers within its city limits. Adjoining cities, however, offer a multitude of employment opportunities with companies labeled as "Major Employers". As taken from the America’s Labor Market Information System (ALIMS) Employer Database, **Table 2-3** identifies major employers in San Mateo County, their location and type of industry.
### Table 2-3: Major Employers near Belmont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Arts Inc.</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Game Designers</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook Inc.</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>9,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin Templeton Investments</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gate Gourmet</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Caterers</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilead Sciences Inc.</td>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>Biological Products</td>
<td>3,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guckenheimer Inc.</td>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>Marketing Programs &amp; Services</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyatt Regency-San Francisco</td>
<td>Burlingame</td>
<td>Hotels &amp; Motels</td>
<td>550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente Medical Center</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente South Sn</td>
<td>South San Francisco</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucille Packard Children’s Hospital Specialty Svs</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Health Care Facilities</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motif Inc.</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Business Services NEC</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle Corp</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Computer Software-Manufacturers</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford Health Care Outpatient Center</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Physicians &amp; Surgeons</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Intl AIRPORT-SFO</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Airports</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Government Offices-County</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Medical Center</td>
<td>San Mateo</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciex LLC</td>
<td>Redwood City</td>
<td>Scientific Apparatus &amp; Instruments-Mfrs</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seton Medical Center</td>
<td>Daly City</td>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>1,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRI International Inc.</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Research Service</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Interior Department</td>
<td>Menlo Park</td>
<td>Government Offices-Us</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visa Inc.</td>
<td>Foster City</td>
<td>Credit Card &amp; Other Credit Plans</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Roadway Network

Belmont’s roadway network consists of approximately 72 miles of roadway including approximately 11 miles of arterial streets, 10 miles of collector streets and over 51 miles of local streets as shown on Table 2-4. A map of the existing roadway network, and street classifications in Belmont is presented on Figure 2-4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Classification</th>
<th>Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arterial Streets</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Streets</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Streets</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Principal Arterial Street mileage includes 1.55 miles segment of El Camino Real (SR 82) within Belmont.

Major Streets & Roadways

*El Camino Real/SR 82* is the highest volume surface street passing through the city, functioning as a north-south principal arterial along a 1.55-mile segment of the City’s core commercial area. El Camino Real connects Belmont residents, businesses and other destinations within the city, including the Belmont Caltrain Station, and provides direct connections to/from adjacent cities to the north and south. Within the city limits, five motor vehicle lanes are provided (four through-lanes plus center-turn lane) plus additional turn lanes at key intersections. Sidewalks and on-street parking are generally provided on both sides (but limited to the west side to the north of the Caltrain station parking lots). Raised medians are provided along its entirety. No bicycle lanes are provided, but a wide striped shoulder in the northbound direction is provided on segments north of the Caltrain Station to Ruth Avenue. The posted speed limit is 35 mph.

*Ralston Avenue* is an arterial street that serves as the only continuous east-west roadway connecting a roughly 4-mile corridor between the east and west ends of City. Posted speeds vary from 30 to 40 mph and many intersections provide marked pedestrian crossings.

- Eastern segments of Ralston Avenue (between US 101 and South Road) provide five motor vehicle lanes (four through lanes and center left-turn lane) with additional turn lanes at some intersections. On-street motor vehicle parking is generally permitted on both sides, except near the intersections with El Camino Real and Old County Road. No bicycle lanes are provided. Sidewalks are provided on both sides.
- Middle segments of Ralston Avenue (between South Road and Villa Avenue) provide a two-way left-turn median, and one motor vehicle lane plus a bicycle lane in each direction. Sidewalks are provided on one or both sides, but sidewalk gaps exist on some segments.
- Western segments of Ralston Avenue (west of Villa Avenue) provide five motor vehicle lanes (four through lanes and center-turn lane) plus right-turn pockets at some locations. No bicycle lanes or on-street parking are provided. Sidewalks are provided on one or both sides, but sidewalk gaps exist on some segments.
Figure 2-4: Existing Roadway Classifications

Source: City of Belmont, 2015; San Mateo County, GIS, 2014; Dyett & Bhatia, 2015; W-Trans, 2015.
Alameda de las Pulgas is a minor arterial providing north-south access between San Mateo and West Menlo Park in San Mateo County. Within the City of Belmont, two motor vehicle travel lanes are provided, one in either direction, with on-street motor vehicle parking available along portions of its length. Class II bicycle lanes are provided south of Ralston Avenue to the City limits. Extending bicycle accommodations north of Ralston Avenue is recommended in the Countywide Plan, but narrow curb-to-curb widths on the northern segments limit options for bicycle lane installation. The posted speed limit in both directions is 25 mph.

Cipriani Boulevard is a north-west oriented collector street that provides neighborhood access between Ralston Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas. Cipriani Boulevard has a posted speed limit of 25 mph, no sidewalks, and shared bicycle/motor vehicle lane (“Sharrow”) pavement markings along its entirety.

Davey Glen Road is a two-lane collector road with on-street motor vehicle parking and a posted speed limit of 25 mph. The street has significant horizontal and vertical curvature and connects El Camino Real and Middle Road with primarily east-west orientation. No bicycle lanes are provided.

Hallmark Drive is a dead-end, two-lane minor arterial with north-south orientation that provides access between the Belmont Heights neighborhood and Ralston Avenue. The road has a curb-to-curb width of 40 feet, on-street motor vehicle parking, and a posted speed limit of 30 mph.

Harbor Boulevard is an east-west oriented street that crosses between the Belmont and San Carlos jurisdictions. Classified as a minor arterial, Harbor Boulevard has posted speed limits of 30 mph and 25 mph to the east and west of El Camino Real respectively.

Hiller Street is a two-lane, north-south oriented collector roadway connecting the Sterling Downs Neighborhood and Ralston Avenue. It has a posted speed limit of 25 mph and is designated as a bicycle route with Sharrow pavement markings along its entirety to the north of Ralston Avenue with available on-street motor vehicle parking.

Middle Road is an east-west minor arterial roadway connecting El Camino Real to the Central Neighborhood. It has a posted speed limit of 25 mph and provides two lanes of motor vehicle travel. Middle Road has significant horizontal and vertical curvature and also provides access to Central Elementary School.

Notre Dame Avenue is a winding collector road through the Central Neighborhood and connects Ralston Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas. The two-lane road experiences significant horizontal and vertical curvature, with minimal space for on-street motor vehicle parking. The posted speed limit is 25 mph, a sidewalk/walking path is provided and sharrow pavement markings are present between Ralston Avenue and Arbor Avenue.

Old County Road is a north-south minor arterial roadway, along a roughly 1.5 mile corridor east of the Caltrain rail tracks, and is a designated Class III bicycle route, with shared travel lane for bicyclists and motorists, providing a regional connection between the Belmont Caltrain Station and adjacent cities such as San Mateo and San Carlos. Two shared motor vehicle/bicycle travel lanes are present through Belmont with on-street motor vehicle parking available. The
posted speed limit is 35 mph, and some sidewalks are provided for pedestrian travel.

6th Avenue is a north-south minor arterial that provides access between Downtown and Central Neighborhood with two lanes of motor vehicle travel, continuous sidewalk until Harbor Boulevard, and no bicycle lanes. The posted speed limit is 25 mph and only one signalized intersection is present on the minor arterial at Ralston Avenue.

Transit Access & Service

Rail Service – Caltrain

Access to the Caltrain rail line is provided via Belmont Station located at the intersection of El Camino Real and Ralston Avenue. Per the 2015 annual passenger count performed by Caltrain, the Belmont Station served nearly 1,400 daily riders, an average of 699 boardings and 666 alightings during 2015. From Belmont Station, Caltrain also provides free shuttle service to Hillsdale Station in San Mateo for passenger connections to Baby Bullet Trains travelling to Diridon Station in San Jose and San Francisco Station in San Francisco.

Bus Service – SamTrans

The San Mateo County Transportation Agency (SamTrans) provides public bus transit services throughout the county. Nine different routes run through Belmont, with four operating on school days only, three as Caltrain connectors, one as a Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) and Caltrain connector, and one as an express route. The BART/Caltrain connector and express route operate exclusively along El Camino Real through the city. Table 2-5 displays available bus lines, direction, and days of operation for the City. Figure 2-5 provides a map of transit routes in Belmont including the Caltrain station.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SamTrans Routes</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Days of Operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#60</td>
<td>School Day Only Route</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Weekday Afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Weekday Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#62</td>
<td>School Day Only Route</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Weekday Afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Weekday Morning and Afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#67</td>
<td>School Day Only Route</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Weekday Afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Weekday Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#68</td>
<td>School Day Only Route</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Weekday Afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Weekday Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#260</td>
<td>Caltrain Connector Route</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#261</td>
<td>Caltrain Connector Route</td>
<td>EB</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Weekends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#295</td>
<td>Caltrain Connector Route</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Weekdays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#398</td>
<td>BART &amp; Caltrain Connector Route</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>7-days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>7-days per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#KX</td>
<td>Express Route</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Weekday Morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Weekday Afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont-Hillsdale Shuttle*</td>
<td>Caltrain Connector Route</td>
<td>NB</td>
<td>Weekday Morning and Afternoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Weekday Morning and Afternoon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Belmont-Hillsdale Shuttle is operated by Caltrain
Figure 2-5: Public Transit Routes

Source: City of Belmont, 2015; San Mateo County, GIS, 2014; Dyett & Bhatia, 2015; W-Trans, 2015; SamTrans, 2016
Existing Pedestrian Network

This section describes the existing sidewalk network within Belmont.

- Providing sidewalks on both sides of each street within Belmont’s 72.5-mile network of streets, if feasible, would result in an approximately 145-mile network of sidewalks.
- Approximately 85 miles of existing sidewalks are currently provided within Belmont – therefore sidewalks are provided on approximately 59% of Belmont street frontages.

A map showing continuous sidewalk facilities within Belmont is provided on Figure 2-6.

Sidewalk Inventory

Streets were assessed for pedestrian and bicycle accommodations through field and data review, and 40 intersection locations in the City were examined. The examination included documenting the presence of pedestrian and bicycle facilities in addition to the volume and distribution of non-auto transportation users. The following discussions describe the results from the inventory.

Streets within the City were assessed for pedestrian connectivity by neighborhood based on the neighborhood boundaries shown on Figure 2-3. The available sidewalk facilities are graded based on the existing infrastructure using a three-tier grading scale:

- Grade 2: Continuous sidewalks on both sides of a roadway.
- Grade 1: Sidewalk facility on at least one side of a roadway or discontinuous pedestrian facilities.
- Grade 0: No continuous pedestrian facilities present.

Table 2-6 summarizes the percent distribution of sidewalk availability throughout the City of Belmont by neighborhood. As shown in the table, Belmont Heights, Homeview, McDougal, and Sterling Downs contain a majority of streets with sidewalks on both sides. However, Central, Cipriani, Downtown, and Plateau-Skymont have a majority of streets that lack sidewalks on both sides. This comparison helps to define areas of Belmont that would benefit most from pedestrian facility improvement, connectivity, and safety.

Table 2-6: Sidewalk Availability by Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Sidewalk on both sides</th>
<th>Sidewalk on one side</th>
<th>No sidewalk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Heights</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cipriani</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeview</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDougal</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plateau-Skymont</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling Downs</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassigned (East of US 101 to Eastern City Limit)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Hills</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rolled Curbs

Many street segments within neighborhoods have sidewalk segments that can accommodate pedestrian travel. However, the curbs on many segments are “rolled,” making them easily mountable by motor vehicles. Coupled with narrow roadway widths, this allows vehicles to park off-pavement, effectively removing walking space for pedestrians. Streets that experience this problem are not fully useable for pedestrian travel.

Many segments of Belmont’s local street network have rolled curbs that are easily mountable by motor vehicles. As a result, there is a high prevalence of motor vehicles blocking sidewalks on rolled curb segments.
Figure 2-6: Existing Sidewalk Network
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Intersection Accommodations for Pedestrians

The project team collected multimodal travel volume counts at 18 intersection locations throughout the City. Additional pedestrian and bicycle data was obtained through previous studies for an additional 22 locations, resulting in a total 40 study intersections. These locations were assessed for pedestrian accommodation through presence of crosswalks and Americans with Disability Act (ADA) compliance at curb ramps. The majority of intersections along Ralston Avenue provide crossing facilities for pedestrians, but throughout the neighborhoods crosswalks are sparse and located mostly in the vicinity of schools. Table 2-7 displays the inventory of pedestrian provisions at the study intersections.

Neighborhoods with existing sidewalk facilities typically access Ralston Avenue, which provides the only continuous east-west access through the City. The northern half of Belmont (north of Ralston Avenue) is very hilly with many steep grades and horizontal roadway curvature. This CPBP aims to focus improvements on the pedestrian network in those areas where facilities are discontinuous or not present at all (as shown in image on Page 24). Provision of a continuous pedestrian network is typically associated with an increase in walking trips, which is a goal of the CPBP.

Table 2-7: Study Intersection Crosswalk & ADA Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Crosswalk</th>
<th>ADA Compliance (Where ramps present)</th>
<th>No Ramps Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Leg</td>
<td>South Leg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Leg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>East Leg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>West Leg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Christian Dr</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Hallmark Dr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Hillcrest Dr</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Tahoe Dr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Davis Dr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Belmont Canyon Rd</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Cipriani Blvd</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Pullman Ave</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Alameda de las Pulgas</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Notre Dame Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Chula Vista Dr</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Notre Dame University</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at South Rd</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at 6th Ave</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Existing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Control Type</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Existing Crosswalk</th>
<th>ADA Compliance (Where ramps present)</th>
<th>No Ramps Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Leg</td>
<td>South Leg</td>
<td>East Leg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at El Camino Real</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Old County Rd</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at Hiller St</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at US 101 SB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Ralston Ave at US 101 NB Off-Ramp</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas at Coronet Blvd</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas at Arbor Ave</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas at Carlmont Dr</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas at El Verano Wy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>El Camino Real at Davey Glen Rd</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>El Camino Real at Middle Rd</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>El Camino Real at O’Neil Ave</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>El Camino Real at Harbor Blvd E.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>El Camino Real at Harbor Blvd W.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Lake Rd at Lyall Wy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Hallmark Dr at Benson Wy/Lake Rd</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>San Juan Blvd at E. Laurel Creek Rd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Cipriani Blvd at Buena Vista Ave</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3WSC</td>
<td>Cipriani Blvd at San Juan Blvd</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Old County Rd at Marine View Ave</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Old County Rd Harbor Blvd E.</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Chesterton Ave at Marine View Ave</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Hiller St at Biddulph Wy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>OWSC</td>
<td>Hiller St at Masonic Wy</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Old County Rd at Masonic Wy</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>AWSC</td>
<td>Middle Rd at Virginia Ave</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: AWSC: All-Way Stop Control, OWSC: One-Way Stop Control, 3WSC: Three-Way Stop Control, W: White Crosswalk, N: No Crosswalk, Y: Yellow Crosswalk, P: Paved Crosswalk, -: No Crossing Present (Three-legged Intersection)
Countywide Plan & Pedestrian Focus Areas

The San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan (Countywide Plan) adopted in 2011 provides a high-level overview of pedestrian and bicycle facilities and designates “pedestrian focus areas” for all cities within the county. Within Belmont, the Countywide Plan designates pedestrian focus areas localized around El Camino Real, and additional zones throughout the City, typically around school locations.

The Countywide Plan is intended to assist in designating priority regional corridors for long-term improvements, but does not identify specific improvements. Instead, the defined focus areas identify areas where pedestrian improvements should be considered, and provides a starting point for the development of pedestrian-related improvement recommendations to be included in CPBP. Figure 2-7 provides a map indicating the designated “countywide pedestrian focus” areas within the City of Belmont.
Figure 2-7: San Mateo Countywide Plan Pedestrian Focus Areas
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Existing Bikeway Network

This section describes existing bicycle facilities within the City of Belmont. Facilities to enhance bicycle travel include designated bikeways as well as bicycle parking facilities.

Types of Bikeway Facilities

There are four classifications of bikeway facilities in California as defined by the State Department of Transportation (Caltrans):

1. **Multi-Use Paths (Class I Bikeways)** – A path physically separated from motor vehicle traffic by an open space or barrier and either within a highway right-of-way or within an independent right-of-way, used by bicyclists, pedestrians, joggers, skaters, and other non-motorized travelers. Multi-use paths are the most popular type of facility. Because the availability of uninterrupted rights-of-way is limited, this type of facility may be difficult to locate and expensive to build relative to other types of bicycle and pedestrian facilities, but inexpensive compared to new roadways. Prime locations for bike paths are areas such as power-line easements, utility easements, canal banks, river levees, drainage easements, railroad or highway rights-of-way, or regional community parks.

2. **Bicycle Lanes (Class II Bikeways)** – A portion of a roadway that has been set aside by striping and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists. Bicycle lanes are intended to promote an orderly flow of bicycle and vehicle traffic. This type of facility is established by using the appropriate striping, legends, and signs.

3. **Bicycle Routes (Class III Bikeways)** – Class III bicycle routes are facilities where bicyclists share travel lanes with motor vehicle traffic. Bike routes must be of benefit to the bicyclist and offer a higher degree of service than adjacent streets. They provide for specific bicycle demand and may be used to connect discontinuous segments of bicycle lane streets. Also, bicycle routes are located on residential streets, and rural roads. If the pavement width is sufficient and traffic volume/speeds warrant, an edge line may be painted to further delineate the bicycle route. Bicycle routes are signed with the G-93 Bike Route marker, but no striping or legends are required.

4. **Separated Bikeway (Class IV Bikeways)** – a Class IV Bikeway is for the exclusive use of bicycles and includes a separation between the bikeway and adjacent vehicle traffic. The physical separation may include flexible posts, grade separation, inflexible physical barriers or on-street parking. Separated bikeways generally operate in the same direction as vehicle traffic on the same side of the roadway. However, two-way separation bikeways can also be used, usually in lower speed environments (35 miles per hour or less).

Photo examples of each of the four types of bikeways are provided on the following page.
Examples of Typical Bikeways

- Multi-Use Path (Class I Bikeway)
- Bicycle Route (Class III Bikeway)
- Bicycle Lane (Class II Bikeway)
- Separated Bikeway (Class IV Bikeway)
Existing Bikeways

**Figure 2-8** provides a map of the existing bicycle network in Belmont. Within the City of Belmont, approximately 5.5 miles of bikeway facilities exist, including roughly 4.9 miles of on-street bikeways on portions of Belmont’s 72-mile roadway network, consisting of:

- 0.6 mile bicycle path (Class I bikeway) provided across US 101, north of Ralston Avenue.
- 2.3 miles of bicycle lanes (Class II bikeways) on portions of Belmont’s 21-mile network of arterial and collector streets.
- 2.6 miles of bicycle routes (Class III bikeway) designated by signage and/or shared bicycle lane markings.
- There are no existing Separated Bikeways for exclusive bicycle use (Class IV bikeways) within Belmont.

The existing bicycle infrastructure is primarily located in close proximity to schools or public spaces. Ten locations in Belmont currently have at least one bicycle facility:

1. **Alameda de las Pulgas**: Bicycle lanes from Carlmont Drive to Carlmont High School.
2. **Cipriani Boulevard**: Bicycle route between Ralston Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas.
3. **5th Avenue**: Bicycle lanes and bicycle route between Broadway and El Camino Real.
4. **Hiller Street**: Bicycle route between Cambridge Street and Wessex Way.
6. **Island Parkway**: Bicycle lanes between Concourse Drive and Belmont Sports Complex.
7. **Masonic Way**: Bicycle lanes between Old County Road and Hiller Street.
8. **Monserat Avenue**: Bicycle route between Newlands Boulevard and Cipriani Boulevard.
9. **Notre Dame Avenue**: Bicycle route between Ralston Avenue and Arbor Avenue.
10. **Ralston Avenue**: Bicycle route between Cipriani Boulevard and El Camino Real with intermittent bicycle lanes.

*Existing bicycle route (Class III bikeway) segment on Cipriani Boulevard.*
Figure 2-8: Existing Bikeway Network
A key goal of the CPBP is to improve bicycle connectivity throughout the City to encourage an increase in bicycling. Provision of bicycle facilities will improve connection between existing facilities and produce connections to other available routes outside city limits. Bicycle facility designation through signage and striping tends to increase community awareness among roadway users. With improvements, bicycle rider safety and comfortability can be enhanced with minimal impacts to vehicular traffic, which is another goal of the CPBP.

**Proposed Countywide Bikeway Network**

The *San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan* (2011) identified existing bicycle infrastructure throughout the County and recommended locations and corridors for bicycle improvements to complete the envisioned Countywide Bicycle Network. In Belmont, four roadways are designated as Key Corridors: Alameda de las Pulgas, El Camino Real, Old County Road, and Ralston Avenue. Aside from these notable streets, the County Plan does not discuss city-scale improvements.

**Figure 2-9** provides a map showing both existing and proposed countywide bicycle facilities within Belmont. Currently, plans are under development for bicycle infrastructure on Alameda de las Pulgas (Four Corners Traffic Study), Old County Road (Old County Road Bike Lanes Project), and Ralston Avenue (Ralston Avenue Corridor Study).
Figure 2-9: San Mateo County Planned Bicycle Network
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Current Rates of Walking & Bicycling

Journey to Work Data

Mode splits for journeys to work are estimated by the US Census Bureau, and in 2014 the work force in Belmont was estimated at 13,424. Based on Census Bureau estimates, 74% drove alone, 8% carpooled, 6% took public transportation, 1% walked, 1% rode a bicycle or used other means, and 10% worked from home.

Table 2-8 summarizes the journey to work travel mode data for Belmont and provides a comparison with countywide data. When compared to San Mateo County, Belmont shows higher percentages of driving alone and working from home, combined with lower percentages for carpooling, public transportation and walking. The rate of bicycling to and from is similar to the countywide average.

Table 2-8 Journey to Work Travel Mode Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction (Residents)</th>
<th>Drive Alone</th>
<th>Carpool</th>
<th>Public Transit</th>
<th>Walk</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Work at Home</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2011-2013 Estimates
3. NEEDS ANALYSIS

The following discussions focus on analysis of existing deficiencies in the City as they pertain to pedestrian and bicycle safety and infrastructure. Here begins the development of the CPBP recommendations to be completed as funding and resources become available. The needs assessment is divided into the following subsections:

- Community Needs and Recommendations
- Safety Assessment
- Complete Streets Needs Assessment
- Recommended Focus Areas

Community Needs & Recommendations

To further understand the existing conditions of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in Belmont, a public survey was developed for residents and walking and bicycling tours were arranged for the community. In addition, the public survey was developed to receive feedback from the local community on the day to day issues/concerns they might be experiencing as a pedestrian and bicyclists. In addition, the public survey was developed to provide an opportunity to the community to provide their input in the development of the CPBP.

Bicycle & Pedestrian Survey

The project team developed a comprehensive online survey for public input on their impressions of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in the City. The surveys covered basic information on the participant and what their typical walking and cycling habits are in relation to Belmont.

The survey was available to the public from December 2015 until late January 2016. The survey received 144 responses.

From the responses, the project team was able to develop an understanding of the attributes associated with typical users. The infographics on the following pages display survey questions and the distribution of responses received. From this information, the development of recommended improvements can have a focus on what the community finds problematic.

The survey gathered input for locations where pedestrian improvements would be most beneficial for the City, and some of the most common roadways mentioned (aside from Ralston Avenue) are Alameda de las Pulgas, Cipriani Boulevard, Notre Dame Avenue, and Old County Road.

Bicycle parking was discussed in the survey and respondents were asked to provide locations that would benefit most from new parking facilities. From the numerous locations, the most common results were focused within Downtown, at major parks and recreational facilities (such as Belmont Sports Complex), civic facilities (such as City Hall), and Belmont Station. Some roadways mentioned by the public that would be most benefitted by bicycle improvements (aside from Ralston Avenue) were Alameda de las Pulgas, El Camino Real, 6th Avenue, and Old County Road. This information becomes essential in the development of a citywide bicycle network. Also
noted from the survey are that the most common types of bicycle trips revolve around activities involving shopping, recreation, and health and fitness. The distances these trips are associated with can extend beyond 10 miles for recreation and health and fitness, and are typically less than five miles for shopping. Other activities that survey respondents travel by bicycle for are school, work, and transit, but these represent a smaller portion of the total.
Of the 144 community survey respondents, 86 were male and 58 were female.

Age of respondent gives understanding of the types of users that make up the walking and bicycling community in Belmont. As shown, the majority of respondents are between the ages of 30 and 49 years.
Skill level was acquired to understand the type of bicyclists found in the City, which is associated with types of facilities users feel comfortable riding on and what facilities are typically used most often.

Learning how often people travel by bicycle helps reinforce the distribution of types of bicyclists in Belmont and shows what bicyclist groups would be affected by the different types of treatments.
To develop future infrastructure plans, understanding why users do not walk to their destinations is important. Specific reasons for not walking can cause some treatments to be ineffective.

By knowing the deciding factors for choosing a route when walking or bicycling, recommendations can be tailored to provide focused improvements.
Gauging level of concern for pedestrian issues provides reaffirmation of trends from other survey questions. The responses show continuity with why people do not walk, and the route choices made when they do.

As with pedestrian issues above, bicycle level of concern was discussed to provide continuity between survey results and narrow the scope for improvement projects necessary to improve the bicycling environment in Belmont.
User-preferred improvements allow recommended measures to be prioritized. Many respondents say they would walk more with the provision of sidewalks, resulting in sidewalks being the most influential factor for walking in the City.

As with the above question, understanding what users see as solutions provides the project team with insight for developing the citywide bicycle network.
Walk & Bike Tour

To provide a more personal opportunity for residents, the project team organized walking and bicycling tours through three portions of the City, focusing on the Central, Cipriani and Sterling Downs neighborhoods. The tours allowed residents to participate on foot or on bike and discuss with project team members on the problems they see on a daily basis. As continual users of the system, the community is one of the best resources available for understanding what really goes on in the City.

During the tours, residents were provided with a map of the area to write comments and express their concerns for walking and bicycling in Belmont. Common comments from the tour areas pertaining to pedestrians revolve around the lack of sidewalks, pedestrian continuity, and pedestrian safety. In the Central and Cipriani Neighborhoods, sidewalks are provided infrequently and discontinuously. This forces pedestrians to walk in vehicular travelled way or on the shoulder of the roads while travelling to a destination. Parking in these neighborhoods is a concern as vehicles are frequently found parked in the shoulder space of sidewalk (as shown in the center image below), which becomes a safety concern for children who walk to school. Residents commented that either provision of sidewalks or an enhanced perception of safety while walking would be the most beneficial to them.

Additionally, there are many sections of sidewalk in the neighborhoods that are discontinuous and have barriers preventing continual movement. An example of this is pictured below right, where the sidewalk provided ends, but a fence extends to the gutter preventing pedestrians from continuing on their initial path.
During the bicycle tours, residents provided excellent insight to the problems they experience as everyday riders. Vehicle traffic volumes and lack of bicycle facilities can be a deterrent from major roadways such as Ralston Avenue or El Camino Real. It was commented by the participants that alternate parallel routes with calmer traffic are found more appealing than the larger streets with bicycle facilities.

Alameda de las Pulgas was mentioned when discussing what areas could benefit most from bicycle facility enhancement, and that the northbound direction is a larger concern than the southbound. In the northbound direction, bicyclists find it difficult to keep pace with vehicle speeds as they travel uphill towards San Mateo, but in the southbound direction, they are able to ride freely with motor vehicles.

Additionally, comments included that provision of designated routes through signage and pavement marking would be appreciated on the parallel routes commonly used by bicyclists. It was also commented that sharrows pavement markings in addition to signs expressing bicycle right of way make bicyclists feel comfortable knowing drivers are more aware of their presence on the road.
Safety Needs Assessment

Reported Pedestrian & Bicycle Collisions

Pedestrian and bicycle collisions within Belmont were evaluated for the last five years of available data. Collisions reported over the five-year span involving pedestrians and bicyclists tend to occur at locations with higher pedestrian and bicycle volumes, and traffic exposure. The majority of reported collisions were on Ralston Avenue, often at locations with limited sight distance or higher traffic volumes. Figure 3-1 and Figure 3-2 shows the locations of all reported pedestrian and bicycle collisions, respectively, within the analysis period.

- From January 2010 to November 2015, there were 1,433 reported vehicle collisions in Belmont, including 112 reported collisions involving pedestrians and/or bicyclists, approximately 8% of total reported collisions.
- Forty-three reported collisions involved pedestrians, approximately 3% of total collisions.
- Sixty-nine reported collisions involved bicyclists, approximately 5% of total collisions.
- Two bicycle and pedestrian fatalities occurred during the analysis period (one pedestrian and one bicyclist).

The distributions of persons-at-fault were determined from the data sets for all pedestrian and bicycle collisions within the analysis period.

- Motor vehicle drivers were determined to be at fault for approximately 70% of reported pedestrian related collisions, with excessive motor vehicle speed being the most commonly cited factor.
- Bicyclists were determined to be at fault in approximately 67% of bicycle-related collisions, due to such factors as failure to properly stop or yield at an intersection and/or riding on a sidewalk. The vast majority of bicycle collisions occurred at intersections where no bicycle lanes are provided.

This analysis used data from the California Highway Patrol (CHP) Statewide Integrated Traffic Records System (SWITRS). The data includes collisions reported to the CHP and local police agencies.

In comparison with other cities in San Mateo County, the rate of bicycle and pedestrian collisions in Belmont is slightly below the countywide average based on population. Belmont accounts for three percent of reported bicycle collisions in San Mateo County, and two percent of reported pedestrian collisions, while 3.5 percent of the population of San Mateo County resides in Belmont. However, the rate of walking and bicycling as a portion of all trips in Belmont is also lower than the countywide average, based on the journey-to-work mode share data cited in Table 2-8 that showed lower rates of walking and using transit for work trips. Redwood City and Menlo Park have the highest number of bicycle and pedestrian commuters within the County and both cities have a larger share of countywide bicycle and pedestrian collisions relative to their share of the population.
Figure 3-1: Reported Pedestrian Collision Locations (2010-2015)
Figure 3-2: Reported Bicycle Collision Locations (2010-2015)
Table 3-1 provides a comparison between the approximate mode share for walking and bicycling against the percentage of total collisions involving those modes of transportation in Belmont. The usage rates are only representative of commuters, they do not include the number of people walking or bicycling for recreational purposes. It is an interesting trend, though, to observe that the percentage of pedestrian and bicycle collisions is higher than the usage rates for the modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Current Usage Rate</th>
<th>Collision Occurrence Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Safety Analysis Recommendations

Based on review of the collision data, the following intersections were identified as focus areas for site-specific assessment of deficiencies based on multiple (three or more) reported pedestrian or bicycle collisions within the analysis period:

- Alameda de la Pulgas and Ralston Avenue: four reported bicycle collisions.
- Chula Vista Drive and Ralston Avenue: three reported bicycle collisions.
- South Road and Ralston Avenue: three reported bicycle collisions.
- Twin Pines Lane and Ralston Avenue: four reported bicycle collisions.
- 6th Avenue and Ralston Avenue: three reported pedestrian collisions and three reported bicycle collisions.
- Masonic Avenue and Old County Road: three reported pedestrian collisions and three reported bicycle collisions.
Complete Streets Review

Based on community input, elimination of sidewalk and bicycle network gaps on the City’s existing pedestrian and bicycle network were identified as priority needs.

Sidewalk network completion will be especially challenging in Belmont given the unique topography, limited right-of-way widths, steep slopes, developed properties and existing vegetation. The majority of the City’s streets lack sidewalks on both sides.

The City’s 21-mile network of arterial and collector streets accommodate the bulk of trips by all travel modes within Belmont. In many cases, Belmont’s unique topography limits travel by alternate routes, as most local streets are discontinuous. Therefore, provision of a complete streets network in Belmont that fully accommodates bicycle travel will ultimately require facilities that optimize bicycle travel on most of the City’s arterial and collector streets, where feasible.

As shown on Table 3-2, currently just 2.3 miles of Class II bicycle lanes are provided on arterial and collector streets within the City, covering 11% of the City’s arterial and collector streets. A recommended goal of the CPBP will be to increase the City’s Class II bicycle lane miles to achieve 25% coverage of arterial and collector streets within five years, and 50% coverage within 10 years. To achieve the goal would require funding for installation of approximately one mile of Class II bicycle lane per year.

Table 3-2: Existing Bicycle Lane Provisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Classification</th>
<th>Total Street Miles</th>
<th>Bicycle Lane Miles (Class II)</th>
<th>Percent with Bicycle Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Arterial Streets</td>
<td>1.9*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Arterial Streets</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collector Streets</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: * Principal Arterial Street mileage includes 1.55 miles segment of El Camino Real (State Route 82) within Belmont.
Recommended Focus Areas

Thorough field review, data collection, and public input allowed identification of specific concerns relating to pedestrian and bicycle accessibility, mobility, safety, and infrastructure. This section discusses the identified locations and their potential improvements as identified through collision analysis, public comment, and the project team’s understanding of the City.

- **Figure 3-3** identifies key deficiencies at the Ralston Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas intersection, an identified safety need location.
- **Figure 3-4** focuses on key deficiencies at Downtown core intersections between City Hall and the Caltrain Station, including the identified safety need location at the intersections of Ralston Avenue with 6th Avenue and Twin Pines Lane.
- **Figure 3-5** summarizes key needs on the east-west corridors east of Downtown, Masonic Avenue and Ralston Avenue, between the Caltrain Station and the bicycle/pedestrian overcrossing of US 101 including the identified safety needs location at the intersection of Old County Road and Masonic Avenue.
- **Figure 3-6** describes key opportunities and constraints for providing enhanced bicycle facilities on the City’s key north-south corridor, El Camino Real, with the greatest potential for providing access to a large number of local destinations.
- **Figure 3-7** summarizes key needs in the Cipriani neighborhood, which has the lowest percentage of sidewalk coverage in the City. The recommended strategy for this neighborhood is to focus on reducing sidewalk gaps on Cipriani Boulevard and improving crossings and bus stops at key locations.
Key Constraint(s)

Bicycle Collisions. The highest number of reported bicycle collisions in Belmont - four collisions involving bicyclists over a five-year period - were reported at this intersection.

Needs Assessment

Lack of bicycle capacity on intersection approaches. Existing bicycle lanes on both Ralston Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas terminate upstream of the intersection. No bicycle treatments are provided for bicyclists traveling on any of the four intersection approaches.

Conflicting movements between bicyclists and right-turning motorists. Majority of reported bicycle collisions (3 out of 4) occurred where bicyclists traveling on Ralston Avenue collided with right-turning motor vehicles. Two-thirds of such collisions occurred on eastbound Ralston Avenue, which has the highest volume of right-turn movements by motorists traveling from eastbound Ralston Avenue to southbound Alameda de las Pulgas.

Bicycle clearance time. One of the four reported bicycle collisions occurred where a cyclist traveling eastbound on Ralston Avenue failed to clear the intersection before the light turned red, resulting in a collision with a northbound motorist. Although not identified as a factor in that collision, in some cases the yellow clearance interval may not provide adequate clearance time for bicyclists.

Location Attributes

Connectivity. Connects the city’s only continuous east/west street – Ralston Avenue – with the only continuous north/south street located west of downtown Belmont.

Access to Downtown & Caltrain Station. Provides the only direct connection for all travel modes between the majority of Belmont’s local residential streets and downtown Belmont, via Ralston Avenue.

Access to Adjacent Services. Commercial uses are located on all four corners of this intersection, providing services to the largely residential neighborhoods west of downtown.
Figure 3-4: Needs Assessment - Downtown Core Intersections

Key Constraints:

- The highest number of bicycle collisions in Belmont were reported on the 2-block segment of Ralston Avenue extending west of Sixth Avenue – a total of seven reported collisions.

- In addition, three pedestrian collisions were reported at Ralston/Sixth and additional two collisions each at El Camino Real intersections with Ralston and Emmet Avenues.

- High traffic volume at Ralston/El Camino intersection.

Location Attributes:

Access to Downtown & Caltrain Station.
Ralston Avenue acts as an access point for Belmont Caltrain Station, City Hall, Historical Society, Community Center, Parks and Recreation, Twin Pines Park, and commercial destinations within downtown via intersections with Twin Pines Lane, Sixth Avenue and El Camino Real.

Connectivity. Connects the city’s only continuous east/west street – Ralston Avenue with connecting streets west of downtown Belmont.

Ralston Avenue provides the only direct connection for all travel modes between the majority of Belmont’s local residential streets and downtown Belmont.

Planned improvement identified in the Ralston Corridor Study will provide an additional parallel route via Emmet Avenue, including a signalized bicycle/pedestrian crossing at Emmet Avenue/El Camino Real, and a short Class I pathway segment connecting City Hall to Ralston Avenue.
Ralston Avenue serves as the only major east-west facility for vehicles. It currently provides sidewalks along most of its length through the City, but there are portions where connectivity is lacking. This corridor is under development through the Ralston Avenue Corridor Study, but it is a focus point within this document based on public comment.

The intersection of Old County Road and Ralston Avenue had two reported bicycle collisions during the last five years and is considered a high priority because of its central location as a key gateway to downtown. From collision reports, it was observed that one collision was the result of a bicyclist riding in the wrong direction on Ralston Avenue near the Caltrain underpass.

With many different land uses in the vicinity and few bicycle connections to access them, this intersection becomes an important focus point. The figure displays the intersection and notes the different concerns observed.

At the intersection of Old County Road and Masonic Way, a total of three bicycle collisions and three pedestrian collisions were reported over a five-year period. This was the highest number of combined bicycle collisions at any intersection in Belmont.

Figure 3-5: Needs Assessment - East of Downtown

**Legend**

- Bicycle collision reported
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**Proposed US 101 to El Camino Real Improvements**

- Bicycle lanes on Masonic Way provide East-West movement between Hiller St and Old County Rd
- End of path to Belmont Sports Complex
- No lanes on Ralston
- Bicyclist riding on wrong side of Ralston Ave in EB direction
- North-South movements have permissive left-turns
Figure 3-6: El Camino Real

Location Attributes:

- El Camino Real provides direct access to many of Belmont’s commercial land uses and to the Belmont Caltrain Station.

- Has the potential to serve a greater portion of bicycle and pedestrian travel demand for trips within the Belmont in comparison with most other City streets.

- Wide curb-to-curb width on most segments may allow for provision of Class II bicycle lanes – and/or Class IV separated bikeway – particularly in the northbound direction, including the existing wide shoulder segment north of the Caltrain Station. In comparison, while planned regional connector route via Old County Road will serve fewer local land uses and Old Country Road will be limited to a Class III shared travel lane facility given narrower right-of-way width.

Key Constraints:

- High motor vehicle travel volumes and travel speeds.

- Long distances between signalized pedestrian crossing locations.

- Lack of bicycle parking at most commercial destinations.
Key Constraint(s)

- Sidewalk gaps throughout the neighborhood, on local streets as well as on Cipriani Boulevard, the north/south collector street serving the neighborhood.

- Completed sidewalk segments are frequently narrow and often obstructed by parked motor vehicles.

- Bus stop locations generally do not provide sufficient space for passenger waiting or disembarking.

- School access constrained by difficult pedestrian crossings for young children at some locations such as Cipriani Boulevard / Carmelita Avenue. Resident noted that downhill motor vehicles increase speed through this intersection where no school crossing signs are provided. One bicycle collision was reported at this intersection.

- Three bicycle collisions reported at Cipriani Boulevard intersection with Ralston Avenue.

Location Attributes:

- Cipriani Boulevard provides direct access to a large number of connecting local streets.

- On most segments of Cipriani Boulevard, completion of sidewalk gaps on one side of the street would be feasible without needs for significant grading or disruption to adjacent properties.
4. PROPOSED CITYWIDE NETWORK & PRIORITY IMPROVEMENTS

This chapter describes the recommended strategies for achieving plan goals.

Network Strategy & Focus Areas

The overall pedestrian and bicycle proposed network strategy and priority improvements center around three concepts known as the "Three B's":

- Belmont Destinations
- Belmont Connections
- Belmont Regional Access

Destinations

As part of the pedestrian and bicycle master plan, it is important to enhance access to/between local destinations. Special emphasis is placed on the following destinations:

- **Downtown:** Located just west of US 101 and centered along El Camino Real, Downtown experiences large amounts of vehicle traffic. However, as the retail and transportation hub of Belmont, Downtown also services many pedestrians and bicyclists. High vehicle traffic volumes make pedestrian and bicycle planning more challenging. Figure 4-3 portrays the special consideration given to the Downtown core bikeways. The pedestrian priority network Downtown focuses on main arterials, such as El Camino Real and Ralston Avenue. The recommended bikeway network includes these arterials, but also focuses on alternate routes to Ralston Avenue (Emmett Avenue west of El Camino Real and Masonic Way east of El Camino Real).

- **Schools:** All of the schools within Belmont are covered by the pedestrian priority network and the recommended bikeway network. As schools generally see large numbers of pedestrians and bicyclists, it is especially important to enhance safety and accessibility around schools.

- **Neighborhoods:** All of Belmont’s neighborhoods are covered by the pedestrian priority network and the recommended bicycle network. The master plan improves connectivity within neighborhoods, but also between neighborhoods.

- **Transit:** Good pedestrian and bicycle access to transit can boost ridership. The public transit routes generally run along Ralston Avenue, Alameda de las Pulgas, and El Camino Real. Other routes travel on collector streets such as Cipriani Blvd and Notre Dame Avenue. All of these routes are covered by the pedestrian priority network, and the planned bikeway network aims to serve these corridors as well.

- **Parks:** The two largest parks in Belmont, Twin Pines Park and Water Dog Lake Park, are covered by the master plan. Pedestrians and bicyclists enjoy easy access to Twin Pines Park, since it is just west of Downtown. The proposed Class III bicycle route on Hallmark Drive grants easy access to Water Dog Lake Park.
Connections

- **Reducing Gaps:** The existing pedestrian and bicycle networks have significant gaps that reduce the desirability of walking and biking in Belmont. Reducing these gaps would help form a more complete network and increase the safety and utility of existing routes.

- **Optimizing Linkages:** Beyond reducing the gaps, it is important to strategically pick linkages to focus on. This ties into linking destinations and focusing on routes that will help the most people.

Regional Access

While destinations and connections focus on travel within Belmont, regional access addresses pedestrian and bicycle travel to/from San Mateo in the north and San Carlos in the south. Regional access mainly concerns bicyclists whom are more likely to travel longer distances.

The existing US 101 overpass provides access to the Bay Trail to the east, while proposed Class II bike lanes on Ralston Avenue connect to the westernmost edges of Belmont. Downtown, Caltrain, and Ruth Avenue Neighborhood Connector, as well as the Old County Road regional corridor provide regional access to San Mateo to the north. Old County Road also provides access to San Carlos to the south. Along Alameda de las Pulgas, existing Class II bike lanes connect to San Carlos in the south, and a proposed Class III bike route connects to San Mateo in the north.

Recommended Pedestrian Priority Network

As described in **Chapter 2**, the existing sidewalk network is comprehensive in Downtown, Sterling Downs, Homeview, and Belmont Heights. However, for the other neighborhoods, there are many gaps in sidewalk coverage, with sidewalks missing on one or both sides of the street.

**Figure 4-1** shows the recommended priority corridors and priority crossing locations. The master plan addresses the gaps in sidewalk coverage, while also identifying pedestrian crossing locations of particular importance.

**Pedestrian Priority Corridors**

The pedestrian priority corridors are grouped by neighborhood below:

- **Plateau-Skymont:** Hillcrest Drive, connecting to San Juan Boulevard, is the main priority corridor through this neighborhood.

- **Belmont Heights:** The priority corridors connect Fox Elementary with Ralston Avenue, and encompass Water Dog Lake Park.

- **Cipriani:** The priority corridor provides access to Serendipity School and Cipriani Elementary School, also including Buena Vista Avenue up to Alameda de las Pulgas.

- **Western Hills:** While no priority corridors run through this neighborhood, Ralston Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas, both priority corridors, border Western Hills.
Figure 4-1: Pedestrian Plan Map

[Map of Belmont with various symbols indicating pedestrian priority network, existing pedestrian/bicycle path, and priority pedestrian crossing locations.]
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- **Central**: A priority corridor winds its way through Central from Alameda de las Pulgas to El Camino Real via Arbor Avenue, Notre Dame Avenue, and Middle Road.
- **McDougal**: Like Western Hills, McDougal is bordered by Alameda de las Pulgas, but priority corridor Chula Vista Drive also runs through it.
- **Downtown**: Besides El Camino Real, which runs through the heart of Downtown, numerous priority corridors service this area. Namely, Ralston Avenue and other east-west corridors strive to make Downtown more walkable.
- **Sterling Downs**: The priority corridor of Hiller Street connects Alexander Park and Nesbit Elementary School to Ralston Avenue.

**Priority Crossing Locations**

In addition, priority-crossing locations were identified throughout Belmont. Some of these locations were selected because of their proximity to destinations, like schools and Downtown. Others were chosen because of their importance to the pedestrian or bicycle network. Below are the 13 priority crossing locations, going from west to east:

- Ralston Avenue/Hallmark Drive
- Ralston Avenue/Cipriani Boulevard
- Cipriani Boulevard/Carmelita Avenue
- Ralston Avenue/Alameda de las Pulgas
- Alameda de las Pulgas/Chula Vista Drive
- Ralston Avenue/Chula Vista Drive
- Ralston Avenue/Twin Pines Lane
- Ralston Avenue/El Camino Real
- El Camino Real/Emmett Avenue
- El Camino Real/Hill Street
- El Camino Real/Ruth Avenue
- Ralston Avenue/Elmer Street
- Ralston Avenue/Hiller Street

**Recommended Bicycle Network**

The recommended bicycle network embraces the Three B’s concepts of destinations, connections, and regional access. The bicycle network serves schools, Downtown, transit, neighborhoods, and parks. Gaps in coverage are filled, and the network dovetails well with the networks of adjacent cities.

The majority of proposed new bicycle facilities are Class III bike routes, but Class I bike paths and Class II bike lanes form a substantial part of the recommended network.

**Figure 4-2** shows the recommended citywide priority bikeway network. The intent is to designate those priority routes, with the goal of completing the majority of proposed future routes between 2016 and 2035, concurrent with the City’s current 2035 General Plan update.

**Figure 4-3** provides an enhanced view of proposed priority improvements near Belmont Village.
Figure 4-2: Bicycle Plan Network Map
Location Attributes:

- El Camino Real provides direct access to many of Belmont’s commercial land uses and to the Belmont Caltrain Station.

- Has the potential to serve a greater portion of bicycle and pedestrian travel demand for trips within the Belmont in comparison with most other City streets.

- Wide curb-to-curb width on most segments may allow for provision of Class II bicycle lanes – and/or Class IV separated bikeway – particularly in the northbound direction, including the existing wide shoulder segment north of the Caltrain Station. In comparison, while planned regional connector route via Old County Road will serve fewer local land uses and Old Country Road will be limited to a Class III shared travel lane facility given narrower right-of-way width.

Key Constraints:

- High motor vehicle travel volumes and travel speeds.

- Long distances between signalized pedestrian crossing locations.

- Lack of bicycle parking at most commercial destinations.

Figure 4-3: Recommended Downtown Core Bikeways
Proposed Corridor Improvements

This section provides detailed descriptions of proposed future projects shown on Figures 4-1 through 4-3. Cost estimates and proposed phasing are described in Chapter 5.

Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan

Ralston Avenue is a key east-west corridor in Belmont that services neighborhoods, retail, schools, and the Belmont Caltrain Station. Ralston Avenue connects US 101 and SR 92 and experiences high traffic volumes. As the most direct east-west route, Ralston Avenue needs to be enhanced for pedestrians and bicyclists. For the corridor plan, Ralston Avenue is broken up into four segments:

- Segment 1: US 101 to El Camino Real
- Segment 2: El Camino Real to South Road
- Segment 3: South Road to Alameda de las Pulgas
- Segment 4: Alameda de las Pulgas to SR 92

Segment 1: US 101 to El Camino Real

Segment 1 is the easternmost segment of Ralston Avenue in the City of Belmont and runs from Hiller Street to El Camino Real. Ralston Avenue is a four-lane road on this segment and connects many vehicles to US 101. Therefore, no reductions in travel lanes are considered.

Pedestrian improvements center on making pedestrian crossings safer. High-visibility crosswalks will be added at Ralston Avenue’s intersections with Hiller Street, Elmer Street, and Old County Road. In addition, pedestrian crossing time will be increased at Ralston Avenue/Hiller Street by altering traffic signal timing. The most significant pedestrian improvement, though, comes from the upgrade of the currently uncontrolled pedestrian crossing at Ralston Avenue/Elmer Street to a pedestrian hybrid (“HAWK”) signal. HAWK signals enhance pedestrian safety while minimizing driver delay. A center median pedestrian refuge area is also being considered.

Bicycle improvements along this corridor revolve around utilizing existing Class II bike lanes on Masonic Way between Hiller Street and Old County Road as an alternative to the busier Ralston Avenue. Masonic Way runs parallel to Ralston Avenue and has significantly lower traffic volumes and speeds. A Class I bicycle path will connect Ralston Avenue to Masonic Way along Old County Road. This path will not only redirect bikes to Ralston Avenue, but also provide access to Caltrain and the future Class III bicycle route along Old County Road. In addition, one-way off-street bicycle paths on Ralston Avenue between Old County Road and El Camino Real will complete this segment. However, for bicyclists wishing to stay on Ralston Avenue instead of taking Masonic Way, Class II bike lanes will be constructed on Ralston Avenue between Old County Road and Hiller Street.

Looking east on Ralston Avenue from El Camino Real.
Segment 2: El Camino Real to South Road

Segment 2 is a small segment that cuts through the core of Downtown Belmont, running between El Camino Real and South Road. The majority of this section is served by multiple lanes that are necessary for the high volume of traffic. Removing travel lanes would prove too crippling to vehicle capacity.

Pedestrian improvements include sidewalk widening and the increasing of crossing times at signalized intersections. Between El Camino Real and 6th Avenue, on-street parking on the south side of the street will be removed to facilitate the widening of the sidewalk. The currently stop-controlled intersection at Ralston Avenue/South Road will be converted to a signalized intersection to reduce conflicts between modes. A pedestrian hybrid ("HAWK") signal at El Camino Real/Emmett Avenue will enhance the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists crossing the busy El Camino Real.

Bicycle improvements focus mainly on routing bikes around Ralston Avenue. A Class III bike route with shared lane markings and signage will run along Emmett Avenue, which runs parallel to Ralston Avenue but has significantly lower traffic volumes. A Class I bike path will connect Ralston Avenue/South Road to the Class III bike route on Emmett Avenue. This path will run through Twin Pines Park and pass City Hall, connecting with the previously mentioned traffic signal installation at Ralston Avenue/South Road. To connect the bike route’s terminus at Emmett Avenue/El Camino Real to Ralston Avenue/El Camino Real, a Class I bike path will be constructed along the east side of El Camino Real. Note that if this bike path is constructed on the west side of El Camino Real, a HAWK signal will not be necessary. However, with current plans to align the Class I bike path on the east side of El Camino Real between Emmett Avenue and Ralston Avenue, a HAWK signal will be installed at El Camino Real/Emmett Avenue. This signal will allow bikes to make a protected left turn from Emmett Avenue to El Camino Real.

Segment 3: South Road to Alameda de las Pulgas

Segment 3 travels between South Road and Alameda de las Pulgas and is the narrowest of the study segments, with one lane in each direction, except at the termini of the segment. A roundabout will be constructed at the entrance to Notre Dame de Namur University, necessitating the construction of a median refuge at Chula Vista Drive for people traveling by foot or bike.

Pedestrian improvements involve sidewalk rehabilitation/construction and crosswalk improvements. On the north side of Ralston Avenue, between South Road and Notre Dame de Namur, the missing sidewalk links will be completed. In addition, high visibility crosswalks with Rapid Rectangular Flashing Beacons (RRFB) will be placed at Ralston Avenue’s intersections with Chula Vista Drive and Maywood Drive. Finally, the crossing distance at Ralston Avenue/Villa Avenue will be reduced by adding a median refuge area and removing the bend in the crosswalk markings.

Bicycle improvements revolve around completing the existing Class II bicycle lanes along Ralston Avenue as much as possible. Currently, an eastbound Class II bike lane exists along the entire segment, except between Alameda de las Pulgas and Academy Avenue. Physical constraints prohibit the construction of a Class II bike lane on this missing link, but a Class III bike route can instead be provided. In the westbound direction, the existing Class II bike lane has more gaps...
than in the eastbound direction. These gaps between Notre Dame de Namur and Chula Vista Drive, Chula Vista Drive and Notre Dame Avenue, and Academy Avenue and Alameda de las Pulgas will be closed with Class II bike lanes, providing a continuous westbound Class II bike lane along Ralston Avenue.

**Segment 4: Alameda de las Pulgas to SR 92**

Segment 4 is the longest segment as well as the segment with the greatest elevation change. The segments runs from Alameda de las Pulgas to SR 92, containing two travel lanes in each direction plus a center turn lane. On this segment there are significant sections where there is a sidewalk on only one side of the street. Pedestrian improvements will widen sidewalks, improve crossing visibility, and fill in some of these gaps. In the near term, bike improvements will be minor, such as adding way-finding signs and bicycle detection at traffic signal controls. In addition, the City’s current Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan calls for Class III bike routes on segments west of Alameda de las Pulgas. However, in the long-term Class II bike lanes on both sides of Ralston Avenue are desirable between Alameda de las Pulgas and SR 92. The Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan did not include these bike lanes due to funding considerations related to desired near-term implementation, but installing Class II bike lanes is recommended by the CPBP as a very long-term improvement.

**Belmont Village & Ruth Avenue Neighborhood Connector**

El Camino Real is the main north-south throughway connecting Belmont to San Mateo in the north and San Carlos in the south. Currently, it only has a wide shoulder northbound from the Belmont Caltrain Station to the northern city limits. El Camino Real not only serves as an important connection to other cities, but also links the Ruth Avenue neighborhood to Downtown Belmont. As such, it is very important to improve pedestrian and bicycle access along this corridor.

The Belmont Village to Ruth Avenue Neighborhood Connector is divided into two phases:

- **Phase 1**: Middle Road/El Camino Real to North Road/Beresford Street via El Camino Real and Ruth Avenue
- **Phase 2**: Hill Street/El Camino Real to North Road/Beresford Street via El Camino Real and Ruth Avenue

The purpose of this proposed project is to:

- Connect the Ruth Avenue neighborhood to Downtown Belmont, and also provide a route for bicyclists to avoid the high traffic volumes of El Camino Real in San Mateo.
- Provide an alternate north-south route to Old County Road on the west side of the Caltrain tracks, that better serves existing businesses along the El Camino Real corridor.
- The terminus of this connector will be North Road/Beresford Street, where a Class III bike route could be extended northward into San Mateo in the future.

**Phase 1** calls for:

- Northbound Class IV separated bikeway on El Camino Real from Middle Road to Ruth Avenue, utilizing the existing wide striped shoulder. This will require the removal of 20 on-street parking spaces on the east side of El Camino Real, but, as these spots are located adjacent to Caltrain parking, the loss
of these parking spots should not impact many travelers. These parking spaces are rarely occupied, anyway.

- Southbound Class II bikeway with sharrow treatments. On-street parking would be maintained. Lane markings could be adjusted to provide a wider curbside lane, with a narrower lane nearest the center median.

In the southbound direction between Ruth Ave and Middle Road, a Class III bike route will be constructed on the west side of El Camino Real. Creating a southbound Class II or Class IV bikeway would be challenging, due to the need to preserve on-street parking for local businesses. From North Road/Beresford to El Camino Real/Ruth, a Class III bike route will be installed along Ruth Avenue.

As part of Phase 1, a pedestrian hybrid (“HAWK”) signal is proposed at Ruth Avenue/El Camino Real to:

- Improve pedestrian access to the northbound bus stop on El Camino Real for neighborhood residents. The current pedestrian crossing, to and from the bus stop, is unsignalized at a high-volume location.
- Facilitate northbound bicycle left-turns from El Camino Real to Ruth Avenue.

Ruth Avenue/El Camino Real (looking north) at proposed location for Pedestrian Hybrid (HAWK) signal to improve pedestrian access to the northbound bus stop, and allow for northbound cyclists to access Ruth Avenue. The existing bus stop (next to the red sign in the photo below) is located on the east side of El Camino Real and an existing marked crosswalk is provided for residents to access the bus stop. This crosswalk requires traversing four lanes of heavy traffic with no traffic signal.
Phase 2 contains the small segment of El Camino Real between Hill Street and Middle Road. As with Phase 1, in the northbound direction a Class IV separated bikeway will be constructed, and in the southbound direction a Class II bike lane will be installed. The northbound Class IV separated bikeway requires the removal of eight on-street parking spaces, but this loss is easily mitigated by the adjacent Caltrain parking lot.

Similar to Phase 1, a pedestrian hybrid ("HAWK") signal is proposed at El Camino Real/Hill Street to:

- **Improve direct pedestrian access to the Caltrain Station to/from adjacent Belmont Village businesses on Hill Street.** Currently, pedestrians wishing to cross El Camino Real must do so either at Middle Road (400 feet to the north) or Ralston Avenue (400 feet to the south), shown in red at right.
- **Allow northbound bicyclists from Hill Street to travel north on El Camino Real.**

Moreover, the walking distance between the North Downtown/Hill Street commercial area and the Caltrain station will be reduced by over 500 feet each way, thanks to this new crossing.
South Downtown to Old County Road Bikeway Connector

The proposed South Downtown Connector project runs north-south on El Camino Real from Emmett Avenue to Harbor Boulevard and east-west on Harbor Boulevard from 5th Avenue to Old County Road. This project connects south Downtown with Old County Road, also linking up with Segment 2 of the Ralston Avenue Corridor project.

On El Camino Real from Emmett Avenue to Harbor Boulevard, Class II bike lanes would be constructed in both directions. This will require the removal of parking in the northbound direction for the segment, but only require the removal of parking in the southbound direction on one block (Emmett Avenue to Waltermire Street). On Harbor Boulevard from El Camino Real to Old County Road, a Class III bike route will be installed, while bike route signage from El Camino Real to 5th Avenue will be provided.

Belmont Village Bikeway

The Belmont Village Bikeway, or Downtown Bikeway, would run from 5th Avenue/Broadway in the south to Middle Road/El Camino Real. This route skirts the western edge of Downtown Belmont and connects Belmont Village to existing Class II bike lanes on 5th Avenue. From 5th Avenue/Broadway to 5th Avenue/O’Neill Avenue, either a Class II bike lane or Class III bike route will be installed. If a Class II bike lane is desired, the conversion of diagonal parking into parallel parking would be required. A mix of Class II bike lanes and Class III bike routes will be utilized from 5th Avenue/O’Neill Avenue to 6th Avenue/O’Neill Avenue to 6th Avenue/Ralston Avenue. From 6th Avenue/Ralston Avenue to Hill Street/El Camino Real and on the spur on Gordon Avenue from Hill Street/Gordon Avenue to Middle Road/El Camino Road, Class III bike routes will be installed.

El Camino Real provides direct access to many commercial destinations and the Caltrain station. Bicycle lanes are not currently provided.
O’Neill Avenue/Hiller Street Bicycle Boulevard

This proposed bicycle boulevard would connect the existing Class III bike route on Old County Road to the bicycle/pedestrian US 101 overcrossing. The route would run on O’Neill Avenue from Old County Road to Hiller Street, then, travel on Hiller Street from O’Neill Avenue to Ralston Avenue. The entirety of the bicycle route would be Class III with wayfinding treatments.

Implementation is simplified due to the fact that O’Neill Avenue already contains treatments similar to bicycle boulevards, with restricted access to Hiller Street from O’Neill Avenue, as seen in the picture at top right.

Bike sharrows such as the ones used at the “Wiggle” in San Francisco can help direct bikes at the turn at O’Neill Avenue/Hiller Street, as seen in the picture at bottom right.
Old County Road Regional Bicycle Route

This bicycle route traverses the entire length of Old County Road that lies within Belmont. South of Ralston Avenue, bicycle route signage currently exists on Old County Road. However, plans include the installation of route signage along the whole length of Old County Road, as well as shared travel lane sharrow markings. While separated from Downtown Belmont by the railroad tracks, this route is a decent regional route through Belmont and avoids much of the congestion on El Camino Real. However, north of Ralston Avenue, the Ruth Avenue Neighborhood Connector is preferable, since that contains Class III bike lanes and Class IV separated bikeways. Old County Road is also the only continuous north-south truck route within Belmont, making it non-desirable for bikes.

Hallmark Avenue Bicycle Route

This residential route travels along Hallmark Avenue from Ralston Avenue to Leigh Way. It is a proposed Class III bicycle route with wayfinding treatments that will connect to Ralston Avenue.
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**Alameda de las Pulgas Bikeway North of Ralston Avenue**
This project covers Alameda de las Pulgas north of Ralston Avenue to the northern city limits. In the near-term, installation of a Class III bicycle route will eliminate a gap in the regional bikeway network. In the long-term, subject to future study, the bikeway segment south of Arthur Avenue could potentially be upgraded with a Class II bicycle lane in the northbound (uphill) direction by converting the existing rolled-curb sidewalk – which is frequently blocked by parked vehicles – to a bicycle lane, while southbound (downhill) a Class III shared lane would remain. Cyclists providing input into the plan noted that they benefit most from bike lanes going uphill, but are generally fine with just sharrows going downhill. Since the construction of the Class II bike lanes would require the conversion of existing rolled-curb sidewalks, this long-term concept is identified only for further study, not included on the bikeway plan map.

**Arbor Avenue, Middle Road & Alameda de las Pulgas Sidewalk Gap Reductions**
This sidewalk gap reduction installs sidewalk segments on this corridor, starting near Notre Dame High School and Central Elementary School. From west to east, this project area includes segments of Alameda de las Pulgas north of Arthur Avenue, and extends east from Alameda de las Pulgas/Arbor Avenue to Belmont Village via Arbor Avenue, then Fairway Drive, then north on Notre Dame Avenue, up to Middle Road, and finally to Middle Road/El Camino Real.

**Cipriani Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Reduction & Cipriani School Access Enhancement**
This sidewalk gap reduction improves pedestrian accessibility to Cipriani Elementary School and the surrounding neighborhood. Beginning at its intersection with Carmelita Avenue, Cipriani Boulevard will have sidewalk segments installed on its west side, closing existing gaps. At Cipriani Boulevard/Carmelita Avenue, the crosswalks will be enhanced to improve school access and increase pedestrian safety.
Bike Sharing Station

Bike sharing systems allow users to rent bicycles on an as-needed basis. Bike sharing stations provide an environmentally friendly on-demand mobility option and make bikes available to non-owners. A bike sharing station is being explored in Downtown or near the Caltrain station. Research on bike sharing from the Transportation Sustainability Research Center at UC Berkeley has shown that 50% of bike sharing members reduced personal auto usage, and 5.5% sold or postponed a vehicle purchase (Shaheen et al., 2014). Besides reducing greenhouse emissions, bike-sharing stations have the potential to stimulate surrounding businesses by providing an easy on-demand mobility option. Development of bicycle sharing stations in Belmont could be coordinated with similar programs in San Mateo and other Peninsula cities.

Bike sharing is typically a partnership with a third-party vendor to operate and maintain the bicycles, station, and the renting system. Operating costs can vary by vendor between $20,000 to $200,000 per year, depending on the number of bike sharing stations, size and type of individual bike share stations, and overall type of bike share program. The annual operating for a single bike share station would be on the very low end of the operating cost range.

Grant funding can cover a pilot program, with additional funding required on an annual basis to continue the program. The City of Belmont can potentially coordinate with neighboring peninsula cities to offer a cohesive bike share program that is long term and can offset the operating costs through a joint partnership.
5. IMPLEMENTATION & PHASING

This section describes the proposed Capital Improvement Program (CIP) list, recommended prioritization criteria, estimated costs, and recommended phasing of improvements between 2016 and 2035.

Prioritization Criteria

While the previous section described the projects that will form the proposed network, this section outlines when and in what order these projects should be completed. Budget constraints necessitate this development of an overarching implementation and phasing strategy. The following prioritization criteria (general, pedestrian-specific, and bicycle-specific) was used.

General Pedestrian & Bicycle Criteria

- Continuity: Many existing sidewalks and bicycle routes are discontinuous or only have facilities on one side of the street. Discontinuous facilities will have higher priority than continuous ones.
- Conditions: Pavement conditions of sidewalks and bicycle routes are poor in places. Unpaved or deteriorated pavement will be of greater priority.
- Cost and Availability of Funding: Perhaps the most influential factors, cost and the availability of funding, can greatly affect the phasing of projects. Lower priority projects may be built before higher priority projects if costs are lower and there is readily available funding.

Pedestrian-Specific Project Criteria

- ADA Accessibility and Compliance: For sidewalks, ADA accessibility and compliance addresses the existence of curb ramps for wheelchair access and sidewalk widths. Sidewalks that fail to meet ADA standards will have higher priority.
- Intersection Crossing Facilities: The number of crossing facilities at an intersection (typically anywhere from 0-4) and the visibility and safety of these crossings affects the prioritization. Intersections with poor crossing facilities will have higher priority.

Bicycle-Specific Project Criteria

- Existing Planned Projects: Bicycle projects already documented in existing city or county plans are higher priority than undocumented projects. For example, Old County Road is an existing regional route, which increases its prioritization.
- Steep Grades: On flat terrain, bicyclists can go faster and coexist with vehicle traffic better. However on steep uphill segments, bicyclists travel much slower and would thus benefit from bicycle facilities. Hilly routes will have higher priority that flatter routes, all else being equal.
The following list uses the above prioritization criteria to assign different tiers to corridors. This provides a general overview of the relative importance of each corridor, but costs and feasibility necessarily alter the recommended phasing of projects. For example, while Hallmark Avenue Bicycle Route is listed as a Tier 4 project, its low cost and immediate feasibility place it on the near-term Phase I project list on Table 5-1.

**Priority Project Corridors: Tier 1 to Tier 4**

- **Tier 1 Corridor: Ralston Avenue (east-west corridor)**
- **Tier 2 Corridor: El Camino Real (north-south corridor)**
- **Tier 3: Alameda de las Pulgas (north-south corridor)**
- **Tier 4: Hallmark Drive, Downtown to Alameda de las Pulgas, and O’Neill Avenue/Hiller Street Bicycle Boulevard**

**Tier 1 Corridor: Ralston Avenue (Primary east-west corridor)**

Ralston Avenue is the primary east-west transportation corridor within Belmont, connecting more destinations and neighborhoods than any comparable corridor in Belmont. Ralston Avenue has the highest number of bicycle and pedestrian collisions of any corridor in Belmont (see Figures 3-1 and 3-2). In many respects, Ralston Avenue serves as the “spine” for all travel modes within Belmont’s transportation network.

Ralston Avenue connects many residential neighborhoods in the western part of town to Downtown. Ralston Avenue also serves the commercial district at the Ralston Avenue/Alameda de las Pulgas, several schools and US 101. Currently, Ralston Avenue has Class II bicycle lanes from Cipriani Boulevard to west of Pullman Avenue, and Villa Avenue to South Road. Sidewalks exist on both sides around Downtown, but are discontinuous around South Road and west of Alameda de las Pulgas. Between 2010 and 2015, there were 15 reported pedestrian collisions with vehicles and 34 bicycle collisions.

The number of collisions on Ralston Avenue is greater than on any corridor. Safety concerns, the importance of Ralston Avenue, and high volumes give Ralston Avenue Tier 1 status.

**Tier 2 Corridor: El Camino Real & Belmont Village (north-south corridor)**

Whereas Ralston Avenue is the primary east-west link in Belmont, El Camino Real serves as the primary north-south link based both on volume and proximity adjacent to Belmont’s commercial core and Caltrain Station.

El Camino Real has the second-highest number of bicycle and pedestrian collisions of any corridor in Belmont (see Figures 3-1 and 3-2). Although regional bicycle travel is envisioned via Old County Road (east of the Caltrain tracks) rather than directly on Old County Road, connections to local land uses are greater on the west side of the tracks, via El Camino Real and some parallel street segments to the west within Belmont Village.

Therefore, this plan recommends a greater emphasis on providing north-south bicycle and pedestrian continuity on the west side of the Caltrain tracks. Nonetheless, this north-south corridor does include Old County Road as well.

This north-south corridor serves Downtown Belmont, the Caltrain station, and provides regional access to San Mateo to the north and San Carlos to the south. Currently, sidewalks exist on both sides of El Camino Real (except north of the Caltrain station where sidewalks are
limited to the west side only), but sidewalks are discontinuous on Old County Road. A Class III bike route exists on Old County Road south of Ralston Avenue. However, two disadvantages of Old County Road necessitate the development of El Camino Real for pedestrians and bikes: Old County Road’s status as a truck route and the railroad tracks that act as a barrier between Downtown and Old County Road. This makes developing pedestrian and bike facilities on El Camino Real crucial to improving service in the north-south direction near Downtown.

Tier 3 Corridor: Alameda de las Pulgas

As the other main north-south corridor, Alameda de las Pulgas provides regional access and connects many residential neighborhoods in Belmont. Currently, sidewalks exist on both sides near Ralston Avenue and to the south, while bicycle facilities exist only south of Ralston Avenue. The steepness of Alameda de las Pulgas north of Ralston Avenue elevates the importance of developing bicycle facilities.

Tier 4: Connectors

The recommended Tier 4 routes: Hallmark Drive that provides a connection to San Carlos; sidewalk gap reductions on Middle Road, Alameda de las Pulgas and Cipriani Boulevard; and O’Neill Avenue/Hiller Street Bicycle Boulevard. These routes are not anticipated to serve as many pedestrians and bicyclists as the higher-tiered corridors.

Proposed Capital Improvement Program

The recommended phasing of proposed projects in the following text and on the tables provided on the following pages.

Near-term (2016-2021) Phase I Projects

Near-term projects include projects currently in the pipeline, focusing on the Tier 1 east-west corridor on Ralston Avenue, north-south regional bikeway connections on Old County Road and Alameda de las Pulgas, and neighborhood connectors that can be implemented in the near-term. Table 5-1 shows the recommended Phase I Near-term projects for completion by 2021.

Mid-term (2021-2026) Phase II Projects

Mid-term projects are high priority – particularly including the Tier 2 Belmont Village north-south corridor, noting that El Camino Real has the second-highest number of bicycle and pedestrian collisions after Ralston Avenue – but require several years to implement, given other projects already in the pipeline. Table 5-2 shows the recommended Phase II Mid-term projects with targeted completion by 2026.

Long-term (2026-2030) Phase III Projects

Table 5-3 shows the recommended Phase III Long-term projects with targeted completion by 2030. Phase III includes the remaining connector projects that are not included in Phase I or II, with the exception of those projects included in Phase IV due to high cost and/or feasibility constraints as described below.

Very Long-term (Year 2035) Phase IV Projects

Very long-term projects are those that are costly and require additional feasibility study. Inclusion of these potential very long-term routes is intended to ensure that interim right-of-way decisions do not preclude the possibility of such improvements. Table 5-4 shows the recommended Very Long-term Phase IV projects.
Table 5-1: Recommended Capital Improvement Program – Near term (2016-2021) Phase I Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>To/From</th>
<th>Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Bicycle Improvements</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan Segment 1 &amp; 2 - US 101 to South Road</strong></td>
<td>Ralston Avenue (from Hiller Street to South Street), El Camino Real (from Ralston Avenue to Emmett Avenue), Emmett Avenue (El Camino Real to City Hall).</td>
<td>Pedestrian crossing improvements including pedestrian hybrid (&quot;HAWK&quot;) signals at Ralston Avenue/Elmer and El Camino Real &amp; Emmett Avenue. Signalized crossing at Ralston Avenue/South Road</td>
<td>Class III bicycle route with sharrow &amp; some eastbound Class II bicycle lane segments, and bicycle signal detection and safety enhancements, on Ralston Avenue. Class I bicycle path on El Camino Real (between Ralston and Emmitt Avenues) and Ralston Avenue (between El Camino Real and Old County Road); and Old County Road (Ralston Avenue to Masonic Avenue). Class III bicycle route with sharrow on Emmett Avenue between El Camino Real and City Hall. Install Class I bicycle path between City Hall and Ralston Avenue/South Road intersection.</td>
<td>$1,162,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan Segment 3 - South Road to Alameda de las Pulgas</strong></td>
<td>Ralston Avenue (from South Road to Alameda de las Pulgas)</td>
<td>Crosswalk enhancements to reduce pedestrian crossing distances</td>
<td>Continuous bicycle lanes on Ralston Avenue between South Road &amp; Alameda de las Pulgas.</td>
<td>$1,620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em><em>Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan Segment 4 (Part 1)</em> - Alameda de las Pulgas to City limit &amp; SR 92</em>*</td>
<td>Ralston Avenue, west of Alameda de las Pulgas to City limit &amp; SR 92</td>
<td>Crosswalk enhancements at multiple intersections, including crossing distance reductions, signal treatments and pedestrian refuge islands.</td>
<td>Wayfinding signs for bicyclists and installation of bicycle detection at signalized intersections. (See Table 5-4 for Very Long-term bicycle lane recommendation on Ralston Avenue west of Alameda de las Pulgas).</td>
<td>$618,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old County Road Regional Bicycle Route</strong></td>
<td>Old County Road (entire length within Belmont)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class III bicycle route signage &amp; shared travel lane (&quot;sharrow&quot;) markings.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hallmark Avenue Bicycle Route</strong></td>
<td>Hallmark Avenue from Ralston Avenue to Leigh Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class III bicycle route with wayfinding treatments (roughly 1.15 miles).</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alameda de las Pulgas North of Ralston Bikeway</strong></td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas, north of Ralston Avenue to City limit</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class III bicycle route signage &amp; shared travel lane (&quot;sharrow&quot;) markings.</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cipriani School Access</strong></td>
<td>Cipriani Boulevard &amp; Carmelita Avenue</td>
<td>Enhanced crosswalk treatment to facilitate school access</td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chula Vista Drive Bicycle Route</strong></td>
<td>Ralston Avenue to Alameda de las Pulgas</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class III bicycle route with wayfinding treatments (roughly 0.7 miles).</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See also Table 5-4 for Part 2 of Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan Segment 4, sidewalk widening west of Alameda de las Pulgas.
### Table 5-2: Recommended Capital Improvement Program – Mid-term (2021-2026) Phase II Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>To/From</th>
<th>Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Bicycle Improvements</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alameda de las Pulgas/Four Corners Study Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas, south of Ralston Avenue to City limits &amp; Dartmouth Street</td>
<td>East side sidewalks on Alameda de las Pulgas, and school access improvements.</td>
<td>Enhancements to existing Class II bicycle lanes on Alameda de las Pulgas.</td>
<td>Includes mini-roundabouts at intersections with Chula Vista Drive and El Verano Way.</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belmont Village Bikeway</strong></td>
<td>5th Avenue/El Camino Real to Middle Road/El Camino Real via 5th Avenue, O’Neil Avenue, 6th Avenue, Hill Street &amp; Gordon Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend 5th Avenue bikeway north from Broadway to Ralston Avenue with Class II bicycle lane and/or bicycle boulevard treatments. Install Class III bicycle route with wayfinding and sharrow markings north of Ralston Avenue on Hill Street and Gordon Avenue to Middle Road.</td>
<td>Segment between Broadway and O’Neill subject to further refinement of options being considered as part of the Belmont Village Specific Plan.</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belmont Village to Ruth Avenue Neighborhood Connector Phase 1 of 2</strong></td>
<td>El Camino Real from Middle Road to Ruth Avenue; and Ruth Avenue from El Camino Real to Beresford Street.</td>
<td>Pedestrian hybrid (“HAWK”) signal at El Camino Real/Ruth Avenue (existing marked crosswalk to/from northbound bus stop).</td>
<td>Northbound Class IV buffered bicycle lane on El Camino Real from Middle Road to Ruth Avenue, using existing striped shoulder north of Middle Road to Anita Avenue, and southbound Class III shared lane on El Camino Real with sharrow treatments, conflict markings and lane-width adjustments. Class III bicycle route on Ruth Avenue in both directions with signage to Beresford Street/North Road at City limit.</td>
<td>Northbound bicycle lane requires removal of 20 on-street parking spaces on east side of El Camino Real (immediately north of Middle Road) adjacent to Caltrain parking lot.</td>
<td>$390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old County Road Pedestrian Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Old County Road (north of Ralston Avenue)</td>
<td>Sidewalk on the west side and conformance of all driveways to ADA standards on both sides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>O’Neill Avenue/Hiller Street Bicycle Boulevard</strong></td>
<td>Old County Road/O’Neill Avenue to US 101 Bicycle/Pedestrian Overcrossing via O’Neill Avenue and Hiller Street</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class III bicycle route with wayfinding treatments (roughly 0.4 miles).</td>
<td>O’Neill Avenue already has some elements associated with bicycle boulevard treatments given restricted access to/from adjacent local streets (north of O’Neill Avenue).</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Belmont Village Bike Share Station</strong></td>
<td>Belmont Village and/or Caltrain Station</td>
<td>Access to on-demand bicycles. Increases travel options and potentially reduces vehicle traffic.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000 (start-up) plus $20,000 annual operational cost for one station. Potentially shared cost with adjacent cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 5-3: Recommended Capital Improvement Program – Long-term (2026-2030) Phase III Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>To/From</th>
<th>Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Bicycle Improvements</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arbor Avenue, Middle Road &amp; Alameda de las Pulgas Sidewalk Gap Reduction</td>
<td>Middle Road/El Camino Real to Arbor Avenue/Alameda de las Pulgas, and Alameda de las Pulgas (north of Arthur Avenue).</td>
<td>Install sidewalks to eliminate gaps, aiming for continuous sidewalk on one side of corridor, starting near Notre Dame High School &amp; Central Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set annual budget, based on a desired portion of City’s annual transportation budget. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cipriani Boulevard Sidewalk Gap Reduction</td>
<td>Cipriani Boulevard (beginning at Carmelita Avenue), extending northward</td>
<td>Install sidewalk segments on west side of Cipriani Boulevard, focusing on reducing existing gaps</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set annual budget, based on a desired portion of City’s total transportation budget. *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Village to Ruth Avenue Neighborhood Connector Phase 2 of 2</td>
<td>El Camino Real from Hill Street to Middle Road.</td>
<td>Pedestrian hybrid (&quot;HAWK&quot;) signal at El Camino Real/Hill Street to allow direct connection from Belmont Village bikeway and reduce pedestrian walking distance from Hill Street to Caltrain station by over 500 feet.</td>
<td>Northbound Class IV buffered bicycle lane on El Camino Real from Hill Street to Middle Road (connecting with Phase 1 bike lane north of Middle Road described on Table 5-3), and southbound Class III shared lane treatment with sharrow treatments &amp; conflict markings.</td>
<td>Requires removal of 8 on-street parking spaces on east side of El Camino Real (Hill Street to Middle Road) adjacent to Caltrain parking.</td>
<td>$275,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Downtown to Old County Road Bikeway Connector</td>
<td>Harbor Boulevard from 5th Avenue to Old County Road; and El Camino Real from Harbor Boulevard to Emmitt Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class II bicycle lanes on El Camino Real from Emmitt Avenue to Harbor Boulevard (South). Class II bicycle lanes in southbound direction can be accommodated from Watermire Street to Harbor Boulevard (South) without removing on-street parking.</td>
<td>Requires on-street parking removal in northbound direction and one southbound block from Emmitt Avenue to Watermire Street.</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Budget for sidewalk gap reduction program should be established as an implementation component of the CPBP, based on a desired percentage of City’s annual transportation expenditures, augmented with grant funds.*
### Table 5-4: Recommended Capital Improvement Program – Very Long-term (Year 2035) Phase IV Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>To/From</th>
<th>Pedestrian Improvements</th>
<th>Bicycle Improvements</th>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan Segment 4 (Part 2)</strong></td>
<td>Ralston Avenue, west of Alameda de las Pulgas to City limit &amp; SR 92</td>
<td>Sidewalk widening along Ralston Avenue and installation of landscape buffers along some sidewalk segments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ralston Avenue Bicycle Lane Completion</strong></td>
<td>Ralston Avenue, west of Alameda de las Pulgas to City limit &amp; SR 92</td>
<td>Installation of bike lanes along Ralston Avenue west of Alameda de las Pulgas to SR 92.</td>
<td>Not included in Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan improvements given grading requirements, but identified here for future consideration.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alameda de las Pulgas/North of Ralston Long Term Bikeway Concept</strong></td>
<td>Alameda de las Pulgas, north of Ralston Avenue to City limit</td>
<td>Subject to feasibility study; replace existing rolled-curb sidewalk on east side of Alameda de las Pulgas with a northbound (uphill) Class II bicycle lane. Provide southbound (downhill) Class III with sharrow treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: identified for future study, not included on Bikeway Network map.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

- **Ralston Avenue Corridor Plan Segment 4 (Part 2)**: Alameda de las Pulgas to City limit & SR 92
- **Alameda de las Pulgas/North of Ralston Long Term Bikeway Concept**: Alameda de las Pulgas, north of Ralston Avenue to City limit
Funding
Implementing the projects identified in the CPBP will require approximately $10 million in funding over the next two decades, primarily via outside sources such as grant funding. Funding could potentially be augmented by developer fees should the City adopt a Transportation Impact Fee (TIF) following the General Plan Update. In addition, some projects can be installed concurrently with street resurfacing and other general improvements, consistent with the City’s Complete Streets Policy. Table 5-5 summarizes potential grant funding sources.

Table 5-5: Potential Grant Funding Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Administering Agency</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Types of projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Active Transportation Program</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Capital &amp; non-capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Active Transportation</td>
<td>Metropolitan Transportation Agency</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Infrastructure projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Bay Area Grant Program</td>
<td>C/CAG San Mateo County</td>
<td>Every four years</td>
<td>Capital and safety/education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Development Act Article 3</td>
<td>C/CAG San Mateo County</td>
<td>Every 2-3 years</td>
<td>Capital and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Co. Measure A Pedestrian &amp; Bicycle Program</td>
<td>San Mateo Co. Transportation Authority</td>
<td>Every 2-3 years</td>
<td>Capital and planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Fund for Clean Air, Regional Fund</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management Dist.</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Fund for Clean Air, County Fund</td>
<td>C/CAG San Mateo County</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Bicycle facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Office of Traffic Safety Grants</td>
<td>California OTS</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Education &amp; enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Safety Improvement Program</td>
<td>Caltrans</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo County Safe Routes to School</td>
<td>San Mateo County office of Education</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Education, enforcement &amp; small capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing &amp; Sustainable Communities Program</td>
<td>California Strategic Growth Council</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIGER Discretionary Grants</td>
<td>U.S. Department of Education</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Capital projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Mateo Co. Bicycle Parking Reimbursement Program</td>
<td>Commute.org</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Bicycle parking &amp; lockers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Rack Voucher Program</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Bicycle parking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendices
Appendix A
School Circulation Maps
USE CAUTION:
- Morning glare from sun can affect visibility
- Always wait for student valet to load/unload

MIDDLE ROAD:
- Be courteous, do not block driveways
- Access school from crosswalk and path
- Always obey crossing guard
- Use marked crosswalks only

Suggested Walking Routes
Inquire with office for latest information on walking school buses

New upgrades to pathway/stairs

Preferred Vehicle Circulation
Parking/Loading Areas

Public Stairs/Cut-Throughs

Estimated Walking Time

Estimated Walking Time

Crossing Guard

WELCOME TO CENTRAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

On-street parking available on Middle, North Roads

Patricia Wharton Park

Suggested Park & Walk Location

11 min.

10 min.

11 min.
Hello and welcome to Central Elementary School! We hope that you will take the time to ensure that your child is safe during arrival and dismissal times. There will be nearly 450 students arriving and leaving school everyday. If necessary, please remind your caretakers who drop-off or pick-up your children about our safety rules for all students.

**Drop-off, Pick-up, & Circulation**

**Mornings:**
Drop-offs start at 8:10am for grades K-5. Please stay in the line until you are able to move up to the circle and DO NOT GET OUT OF YOUR CAR IN THE DROP-OFF ZONE. There will be ‘Kiddie Valet” students and parents to get children and their things out of the car quickly and easily. For safety and courtesy, please NO CELL PHONES OR CUTTING AHEAD IN LINE, and always follow the parent volunteer instructions.

**Afternoons:**
The area in front of the school must remain empty of parked cars before and during pick-up. DO NOT ARRIVE FOR PICK-UP BEFORE DISMISSAL TIME. If you are the first car in line, pull up to the white zone by the Dolphin Fountain. Never pass or cut into the pick-up line, as this is dangerous. If you are in a hurry, come early and park in an empty parking space, get out of your car and go meet your child in front of the school.

**Parking:**
You may park in any of the unmarked parking spaces at any time. Please park in the back of the school for special events. DO NOT PARK IN THE CIRCLE LOADING AREA, near the flagpole, in handicap or red curb zones. Never park in designated staff spaces, even for a few minutes, and respect (do not park in) the auction winner space. Remember, that space was paid for to the benefit of the school.

**Safety Tips**

- **Be a Role Model When Driving.** Remember 25mph is the speed limit, not the minimum, for main roads leading to Central and is too fast for sharp curves and where pedestrians are walking in the street.
- **Walk against the flow of traffic when traveling in the street.** Hold your child to the inside and stay visible and alert.
- **Look for traffic from both directions, especially when crossing on sharp curves and at the entrance to the school driveway from Middle Road.**
- **By all means, lace up those sneakers and tackle the hills.** Due to the topography and narrow streets, however, bicycling and scooters/skateboards are not permitted on campus.

Did You Know?

San Mateo County and the Belmont Redwood Shores School District have a Safe Routes to School program, funded in part by the Bay Area’s Climate Action Initiatives Program.

To learn more about potential school improvements, activities, and ways to get involved email mshelton@brssd.org or visit www.smcoe.ca.k12.gov/sr2s

**Travel to Central Elementary**

- **Walks:** 27%
- **Carpools:** 13%
- **Bikes:** 0%
- **Driven:** 57%
- **Transit:** 1%
- **Other:** 0%

**STRENGTH IN NUMBERS.** Despite the hills and other barriers, more than a quarter of students walk to Central. Many other families drive responsibly by carpooling. Traveling together can help strengthen the school community while keeping pollution out of the air and congestion off our streets.

Look for upcoming Walk & Roll events, including International Walk to School Day in October, or consider starting/joining a Walking School Bus to get these numbers even higher. The school, city, and planet will thank you.
**Cipriani Elementary School Circulation Map**

- **Monserat Avenue**: Use caution. Narrow sidewalks and parked cars force pedestrians into the street. Parents are encouraged to wait for valet assistance with load/unload.
- **Buena Vista Avenue**: Pedestrians encouraged to walk on west side of Cipriani Blvd and south side of Buena Vista Ave. Careful of children in street; always obey crossing guard.
- **Ponce Avenue**: Suggested walking route. Inquire with office for latest information on walking school buses.
- **Lincoln Avenue**: Preferred vehicle circulation. Estimated walking time.
- **Cipriani Boulevard**: Valet load/unload (Managed Operations).
- **Severia Park**: Suggested park & walk location.

**Tips**:
- **ALL FULL**: The rear parking lot fills up quickly; after 8:10 AM, only Footsteps Preschool parents may drop off here. Try unloading on Buena Vista Avenue instead.
- **USE CAUTION**: No sidewalks on Cipriani Boulevard.
Hello and welcome to Cipriani Elementary School! We hope that you will take the time to ensure that your child is safe during arrival and dismissal times. There will be nearly 400 students arriving and leaving school every day. If necessary, please remind your caretakers who drop-off or pick-up your children about our safety rules for all students.

**Drop-off, Pick-up, & Circulation**

**Mornings:**

**Valet Drop-off:** The white curb along the front of the school is reserved for unloading starting at 8:10 am, when Cipriani staff and parent volunteers will begin to greet your child(ren) and guide them safely onto the campus playground. There will be no supervision of students before 8:10 am, so PLEASE DO NOT DROP OFF YOUR CHILD BEFORE STAFF ARRIVES. Use Monserat or Lincoln Avenue to circulate through the neighborhood (no u-turns or left-turns into valet service) and do not get out of your car or cut ahead once in line.

**Park & Walk/Walk:** For parents who prefer to park and walk their students onto campus or walk from home, THANK YOU! We recognize the benefits of having fewer cars in front of the school and of children active and ready to start the day. We also value the parent networking and sense of community that it fosters here at Cipriani. For those interested in formalizing morning walks as part of a “walking school bus” please inquire with the office. To ensure an efficient and timely start of the school day, we ask that parents move to the Cipriani courtyard (grassy area in front near the flagpole) promptly at 8:25 am!

**Afternoons:**

To reduce noise/activity levels between dismissal times, we have identified a preferred waiting area for parents at the front flagpole courtyard. Teachers will accompany their students from class to be dismissed and will supervise students until a parent or other responsible adult receives them. 10 minutes after dismissal, all children without a responsible adult will be brought to the office until they are picked up. Students going to the Aftercare Program will follow their usual routine at dismissal and transition to that area.

**Did You Know?**

San Mateo County and the Belmont Redwood Shores School District have a Safe Routes to School program, funded in part by the Bay Area’s Climate Action Initiatives Program.

To learn more about potential school improvements, activities, and ways to get involved email mshelton@brssd.org or visit: [www.smcoe.ca.k12.gov/sr2s](http://www.smcoe.ca.k12.gov/sr2s)

**Travel to Cipriani Elementary**

**MORNINGS**

- Driven: 26%
- Walks: 58%
- Bikes: 13%
- Other: 0%

**AFTERNOON**

- Driven: 74%
- Walks: 26%
- Bikes: 13%
- Other: 0%

**ROUND TRIP TICKETS PLEASE?** Despite the hills and traffic barriers, more than a quarter of students walk to Cipriani in the morning, and many other families carpool. In the afternoon, many more children get picked up alone in their family vehicle.

We know it can be difficult to coordinate all those after-school activities or leave early from work, but a reminder that even one less car trip a week can help reduce air pollution and contribute to a healthier planet. And there’s good news ahead...the City of Belmont is actively seeking to improve travel conditions in the neighborhood, including along and across Ralston Avenue.

**Safety Tips**

- **Be a Role Model When Driving.** Remember 25 mph is the speed limit, not the minimum, for main roads leading to Cipriani. There are many sharp curves and blind turns on the streets around school, so if you drive, drive slow and be a role model.

- **Travel against the flow of traffic when walking in the street.** Hold your child to the inside and stay visible and alert.

- **Look for traffic from both directions, especially when crossing on sharp curves and at intersections near the school.**

Funding for this program made possible by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County.
WELCOME TO FOX ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

Drop off older students on Hallmark Drive to access the path from Ralston Avenue

Always use the crosswalk

Pull all the way up to the curb before loading students

Teachers assist student drop-off and pick-up

No parking along the curb during morning drop-off and afternoon pick-up periods

Inquire with office for latest information on walking school buses

Estimated Walking Time

Suggested Walking Routes

Preferred Vehicle Circulation

Multi-Use Pathway

Public Stairs/Pathways

Crossing Guard

Bicycle Parking

Load / Unload Zone

Park & Walk or Remote Drop-Off Locations

6 min.

3 min.

8 min.

Estimated Walking Time
Hello and welcome to Fox Elementary School! We hope that you will take the time to ensure that your child is safe during arrival and dismissal times. There will be nearly 450 students arriving and leaving school everyday. If necessary, please remind your caretakers who drop-off or pick-up your children about our safety rules for all students.

**Drop-off, Pick-up, & Circulation**

**School Parking Lot & Drop-Off Zone:**
Students are allowed to gather at school starting at 8:00am, with students lining up for class at 8:25. Students are not allowed on school grounds before 8:00am. Drivers must pull fully over to the white curb before dropping off or picking up students. DO NOT unload students from the travel lane. The left lane is for exiting the parking lot or for accessing the school parking lot, and not for cutting ahead of other cars waiting to use the loading zone.

The southern end of the parking lot can be used as an overflow if the parking lot is full. DO NOT park in any STAFF-marked parking spaces before 8:15. If you park, please use the crosswalk in the parking lot, and do not cross loading zone travel lanes.

**Helpful Tips:**
Older students can be dropped off and picked up on Hallmark Drive, just south of Ralston Avenue. A path from Ralston Avenue to Fox Elementary provides a faster walking route for students.

Parents can park-and-walk on St. James Road south of Benson Way. Parking here avoids the crowds. Try to arrive early. There is very little traffic from 8:00 to 8:10, and heavy traffic from 8:20 to 8:25.

Always use the crosswalk in the school parking lot. Setting a good example for students reinforces safe habits for life.

Look for traffic from both directions, especially when crossing Ralston Avenue. Traffic can move very fast on this street: look left, look right, then look left again.

**Safety Tips**

**Be a Role Model When Driving.** Even though Ralston Avenue is the main traffic corridor for most of Belmont, the speed limit (note: not minimum) near Ralston Middle is 25 mph during school hours. Be mindful, and drive safely and slowly when approaching the school.

**Did You Know?**

San Mateo County and the Belmont Redwood Shores School District have a Safe Routes to School program, funded in part by the Bay Area’s Climate Action Initiatives Program.

To learn more about potential school improvements, activities, and ways to get involved email mshelton@brssd.org or visit: www.smcoe.ca.k12.gov/sr2s

**UPHILL BATTLE, LITERALLY.** Fox Elementary is located amongst the steep hillsides of western Belmont, making active transportation choices difficult. Even so, almost 1 in 5 students walks to school each day. Good job, but we think we can do better!

Look for upcoming Walk & Roll events, including International Walk to School Day in October, to help learn more about ways to make walking safer and more fun - yes, even on the hills. Think of it as going to the gym a few days a week for free. The school, city, and planet will thank you.

Funding for this program made possible by the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County.

**Travel to Fox Elementary**

- Driven, 72%
- Walks, 18%
- Bikes, 0%
- School Bus, 0%
- Carpool, 9%
- Other, 0%