## San Pablo Avenue Multimodal Corridor Study Phase 2 Contra Costa County Segments, Concept Alternatives Summary

Alternative	Transit	Bikes	Pedestrians	Parking	Trees / Landscaping	
Alt 1 1) Transit (Side) 2) Bike 3) Parking 4) Auto	Benefits: Improved travel time and reliability; more flexibility if lanes are not fully continuous Drawbacks: Not as beneficial as center-running due to parking and right-turn intrusion	Benefits: Continuous bike lanes Drawbacks: Some segments don't allow for bike lane protection; may be shared with right-turns in some locations	Allows for widened sidewalks where deficient	Significant limitation of parking; parking possible on only one side and only on some segments	Impacts to trees or landscaping where median is shifted or where sidewalk widened. Potential for additional landscape strips along sidewalks.	Includes would re Relativel space, m
Alt 2: 1) Transit (Center) 2) Bike 3) Parking 4) Auto	Benefits: Optimal configuration for transit by avoiding any auto friction Drawbacks: Would need minimum length of continuous center running because it is more challenging to get in/out; challenging to operate multiple transit service types with differing stops	Similar to Alt 1, but additional segments limited to Class II facility. Increased likelihood of shared facility with right-turning vehicles at intersections.	Similar to Alt 1, with slightly less opportunity for widened sidewalks	At least one side parking possible in all areas of the corridor where parking is currently provided	Would likely require removal or relocation of all median landscaping and some curbside street trees. Potential for some additional landscaping in certain locations.	Left turns signals co are locat Allows fo of El Cerr Bus stop preclude and no m Much mo <i>Alternati</i> <i>avoid/m</i> <i>lane in o</i>
Alt 3: 1) Auto 2) Bike 3) Transit (Side) 4) Parking	Transit benefits limited primarily to queue jumps at intersections	Similar to Alt 1, but placing autos next to bikes instead of buses makes bike lane comparatively less comfortable	Similar to Alt 2	No parking feasible	Similar to Alt 1	Provides Relativel Allows fo Alternati (Class II)
Alt 4: 1) Transit (Side) 2) Parking 3) Auto 4) Bike	Similar to Alt 1, but likely provides less transit benefits due to additional parking friction	Mixed opportunities for additional bicycle facilities. May provide space for shared-use path or upgrade of Class II to Class IV in limited segments.	Similar to Alt 1, but also includes locations where sidewalk can be widened to shared-use facility for mixed- use by bikes and pedestrians.	Preserved where currently provided	Similar to Alt 1, with less median impact, but additional impacts associated with relocating trees for shared-use path	Provides Easier to Shared-u Alternati minimal
Alt 5: 1) Auto 2) Parking 3) Managed Lane w/ Transit 4) Bike	Benefits: During bus use of curb lane, allows for improved travel time and reliability with no parking friction in El Cerrito/Richmond Drawbacks: Still has right-turn friction; would require enforcement to remove parked cars in violation; cannot be provided where parking currently doesn't exist	Bike facilities limited to current locations	Similar to Alt 1	Parking preserved where it exists today, but would be precluded in peak hours/ direction	Similar to Alt 1, with less median impact	Manageo Insufficie Least mo

## **Other Notes/Variants**

es a mix of transit islands and curbside stops. Curbside stops require mixing with bikes.

ely easier to construct, although due to re-allocation of median may need to be reconstructed in several segments.

rns are only possible at signalized intersections. Additional could be added. Left turns may not be feasible where stops ated.

for a managed parking/auto lane in one direction in portions errito

op placement will need to be carefully considered as it may de left-turning maneuvers. Allows for dedicated bus stops mixing with bikes.

more difficult to construct

atives include prioritizing parking over bike to minimize parking loss or providing a full time second auto one direction over portions of the corridor (as opposed to maged lane with parking)

es minimal transit benefit but continuous bike facilities

ely easier to construct

for a mix of bus islands and bus/bike mixing zones at stops

atives include providing minimum continuous bike facility II/buffered Class II) but maintaining some parking

es opportunity for bus bulbs at rapid transit stops

to construct dedicated transit lane

-use path feasibility would need to be further evaluated

atives include sacrificing some parking to provide at least a al continuous bike facility or a shared-use path

ed lane provides flexibility, but enforcement will be critical. cient space for managed lane in portions of San Pablo

nodification to the existing corridor; easiest to construct