

Bellingham Bicycle Master Plan

April 2024



Acknowledgements

Great appreciation is extended to the numerous community members and bicycling enthusiasts who participated in the Bicycle Master Plan (Plan) update process and provided their thoughtful input. Their creativity, energy, and commitment were critical to the success of this planning effort.

City of Bellingham Staff

Eric Johnston, PE, Public Works Director

Joel Pfundt, AICP CTP, Assistant Public Works Director - Transportation

Natalie Monro, Public Works Communications and Outreach Coordinator

Riley Grant, Public Works Communications and Outreach Program Manager

Jesse Herrick, Systems Analyst

Robin Cummings, Senior GIS Analyst

Chris Behee, GISP Long Range Division Manager,
Planning & Community Development

Steve Haugen, Superintendent – Traffic/Parking/Fiber

Mike Wilson, PE, Assistant Public Works Director - Engineering

Shane Sullivan, PE PTOE, Transportation Engineer

Peter Gill, Park Planning and Development Coordinator

Transportation Commission

Addie Candib, Chair Betty Sanchez

Cindy Dennis Katy Scherrer

Caroline Dietzgen Tim Wilder, Vice Chair

Keith Moore Addie Yake (former)

Jacki Quinn

Consultant Team

Toole Design with support from the Transpo Group



Contents

| | | | |
|--|-----------|---|------------|
| Executive Summary | 1 | 7 Programmatic Actions | 53 |
| Plan Goals | 2 | Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Programs | 54 |
| The Planning Process..... | 3 | Expand and diversify the bicycling community ... | 54 |
| Network Development | 6 | Bike/scooter share | 54 |
| Bicycle Network Recommendations..... | 6 | E-bike rebate programs | 56 |
| Implementation..... | 7 | Provide more bicycle parking | 56 |
| Plan Components | 7 | Reduce driving speeds..... | 58 |
| | | Develop engineering standards | 58 |
| 1 Introduction | 9 | Systematically implement a wayfinding system. | 59 |
| Bicycle Network Implementation Progress..... | 10 | Engage the community in bikeway maintenance | 59 |
| | | Partner with local businesses, colleges, and bicycle organizations | 60 |
| 2 Community Engagement | 13 | Create streets for people | 60 |
| Community Engagement Process | 13 | Provide educationfor motorists | 62 |
| Engagement Reach..... | 16 | Expand bicycle education opportunities | 62 |
| Key Findings from Community Engagement | 16 | Distribute information on proper use of bicycle facilities | 62 |
| | | 8 Implementation | 65 |
| 3 Existing Conditions | 21 | How projects are scored and ranked..... | 66 |
| On-street Bike Network..... | 22 | Implementation Strategies | 71 |
| Technical Analysis | 27 | Funding sources..... | 78 |
| | | Performance measures..... | 80 |
| 4 Policy Recommendations | 31 | Appendix A: Engagement Summary... | 84 |
| | | Appendix B: Network Prioritization Framework | 110 |
| 5 Bicycle Facility Design and Maintenance | 37 | Appendix C: Funding Sources for Bicycle Projects and Programs..... | 114 |
| Design Needsof Bicyclists..... | 37 | Appendix D: Project List | 120 |
| Maintenance..... | 40 | | |
| 6 Bicycle Network Recommendations | 43 | | |
| Bicycle Network and Project Recommendations... | 45 | | |




Executive Summary

Bellingham routinely makes it onto “best places to live” lists within the US partly due to its walkable and bikeable neighborhoods. It boasts one of the highest walking and biking transportation mode shares in the State of Washington. Over the years, Bellingham has successfully implemented a multimodal approach to transportation planning and has built an extensive network of bikeways. There is strong support for bicycling - community members are passionate about making their city a safer and more inviting place to bike and walk. In the Fall of 2020, Bellingham was promoted from Silver to Gold level designation by the League of American Bicyclists’ Bicycle Friendly Community program. Although progress has been made, there is still much work to do and the public has clearly stated they want to see the City continue its efforts to build out a connected, safe, and comfortable network with a focus on meeting the needs of people of all ages and abilities.

It has been 10 years since Bellingham created its first Bicycle Master Plan (2014 Plan). The 2014 Plan defined a 170-mile Primary Bicycle Network and identified 203 bikeway and 26 crossing improvements on a prioritized project list. Since 2014, the City has implemented 106, or 52%, of the total 2014 Plan projects. This Plan update reflects the tremendous progress the City has made with implementation over the past 10 years, and it identifies projects, policies, and programs that will guide continued progress in making Bellingham a safe and comfortable place to bike. It also acknowledges that the recommended projects and actions for creating a fully connected, all ages and abilities bikeway network are ambitious and not fully funded for implementation over the next 10 years.

The Plan follows the modal hierarchy established in Bellingham’s Complete Networks Ordinance (Figure 1). It prioritizes the safety and needs of the most vulnerable users of the citywide multimodal transportation network.

Figure 1: Bellingham’s Transportation Modal Hierarchy





PLAN GOALS

This updated Bicycle Master Plan (Plan) identifies policies, projects, and programs to achieve the following goals:



GOAL 1:

SAFETY.

Improve bicyclist and micromobility¹ user safety and comfort through well-designed bikeways and by promoting safe driving, walking, and bicycling behaviors.



GOAL 2:

EQUITY.

Build a bicycle network for people of all ages and abilities by prioritizing investments in underserved communities.



GOAL 3:

CONNECTIVITY.

Complete a citywide network of bikeways that connect people of all ages and abilities to homes, jobs, shopping, schools, services, and recreation areas.



GOAL 4:

INCREASE RIDERSHIP.

Increase the percentage of trips made by bicycle and micromobility to support Bellingham's Climate Action Plan² and promote a healthy Bellingham.

¹ The Federal Highway Administration broadly defines micromobility as any small, low-speed, human- or electric-powered transportation device, including bicycles, scooters, electric-assist bicycles, electric scooters (e-scooters), and other small, lightweight, wheeled conveyances.

² The Climate Action Plan calls for 27 percent of trips being made by walking, biking, and transit by 2036.

THE PLANNING PROCESS

The project team, which consisted of representatives from the City of Bellingham's Public Works, Planning and Community Development, and Parks and Recreation Departments as well as a consultant team, worked to develop this plan over a 24-month period, beginning in April 2022 and completing work in March 2024. The Bellingham Transportation Commission, comprised of members with a range of perspectives and expertise, provided input to the project team.

Outreach & Engagement

Community feedback is the foundation for this Plan. The City actively sought feedback from the Bellingham community and endeavored to have an inclusive engagement process to hear from people who may

not have otherwise provided their input. A variety of outreach and engagement methods were used including event tabling, meetings with community groups and the business community, virtual open houses, a citywide survey and interactive webmap, a comment box at the library, and online through the Engage Bellingham platform (see Table 1). Public outreach and engagement efforts (detailed in Chapter 2) offered opportunities for the Bellingham community to provide feedback on specific locations and issues of concern, where they would like to see network improvements, and policies and programmatic actions that will support bicycling as a safe, viable, and attractive form of transportation and recreation. Bellingham community members provided valuable information about challenges and opportunities for bicyclists in the city and Urban Growth Area.

Table 1: Summary of Plan Development Phases and Engagement Strategies

| | Discovery Phase | Draft Plan | Final Plan |
|-----------------------|--|---|--|
| Plan Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan & policy review Existing conditions analysis Identify location-based needs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Network development Project identification and prioritization framework Policies and programs Implementation strategy Cost estimates | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refined recommendations |
| Outreach & Engagement | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online information (Engage Bellingham) Community survey Interactive web map Technical Review Committees Transportation Commission Open House Targeted outreach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online information and comment submission (Engage Bellingham) Interactive online Story Map Virtual open house Drop-in "office hours" Transportation Commission Targeted outreach | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Online draft review Transportation Commission |



Key Themes from the Community

Below are key themes from the public input received and how this input was used to shape the Plan update.

Need for Higher Comfort Bikeways:

The community asked for higher comfort bikeways that are focused on providing additional separation from streets with high traffic volumes and vehicle speeds, such as separated bike lanes, bike boulevards, and trails throughout the city. [Policy 1.1](#) establishes that the City will prioritize building all ages and abilities bikeways and provide clear justification if such a bikeway is not feasible or appropriate. The proposed network recommends both new, high-comfort bikeways (e.g., bicycle boulevards, separated bike lanes, and trails) and upgrading existing bikeways to be higher comfort with the goal of attracting a broader spectrum of bicyclists and micromobility users.

Safety at Intersections and Street Crossings:

The public noted that many intersections and street crossings did not feel safe and that these locations can be a significant barrier for people who choose to travel by bike. Specific locations that were identified by the public were analyzed and many were included in the spot recommendations in this Plan. Some of these locations were included as projects in the Pedestrian Master Plan. Safer street design, dedicated bicycle crossings, pedestrian and cyclist bridges, improved signage, traffic calming, increased visibility, and signal strategies (i.e., No Turn on Red) are among the strategies included in the [Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Toolbox](#) for safer street crossings.

More Education and Enforcement of Motorists:

Respondents expressed feeling unsafe while biking due to motorists exceeding the speed limit, not looking for bikes when turning, and merging conflicts. Requests were made to lower speed limits on certain streets and additional signage to indicate desired motorist behavior. Programmatic actions include conducting a citywide speed study to determine where posted speeds should be lowered and what strategies are needed to align design speed with target (posted) speed as well as education for motorists about safe driving behavior around people who are walking, rolling, and biking.

Missing Links:

Over 100 webmap and survey comments identified missing links in the bicycle network, including bike lanes ending abruptly, incomplete trails, and barriers to crossing busy streets and I-5. The Plan includes a goal of increased connectivity, policies for achieving better connectivity, and network recommendations for spot improvements to close network gaps and enhancements to busy street crossings and I-5 crossings.

Bike Parking:

Respondents expressed a need for safe and secure bike parking, especially around the city center as well as at retail centers, sports fields, trailheads, medical centers, recreational facilities, and according to one comment, “anywhere there is car parking.” [Policy 4.5](#) and a programmatic action recommends the provision of more short- and long-term bike parking in any place there is vehicle parking and establishment of a bike parking program.

Maintenance:

The community expressed desire for regular removal of debris, repair of pavement, restriping of worn bikeway markings, and prioritizing snow removal in bicycle lanes. There was also a request for the provision of temporary bicycle facility routes offering the same level of protection and signage when off-street or protected routes are closed due to construction or maintenance activities. The Plan includes both a section on maintenance and [Policy 1.7](#), which underscore the importance of dedicating more resources to maintenance as the City grows its bikeway network and implements more separated bike lanes, which have unique maintenance needs.

NETWORK DEVELOPMENT

The Plan update recommends new bikeway network connections, as well as where upgrades to existing facilities should be made. The project team systematically evaluated bicycle network needs, including level of traffic stress (i.e., how comfortable the network is for the average person) and connectivity gaps. These data-derived needs were then combined with needs identified by the public to create a comprehensive list of “location-based needs.” These location-based needs were then evaluated to determine appropriate engineering solutions and feasibility. Many of these locations and solutions were then developed into specific corridor and spot location project recommendations. Bicycle network development also entailed close coordination with the City of Bellingham Parks and Recreation Department to determine which off-street trail facilities are appropriate for bicycle travel and would add connectivity value to the overall bicycle network.

BICYCLE NETWORK RECOMMENDATIONS

Network recommendations reflect input from the Bellingham community, City staff, the Transportation Commission, and advocacy organizations. Goal-driven objectives that framed the development of the Plan project list include the following:

- Provide a high-comfort bicycling experience for people of all ages and abilities.
- Improve bicycle connectivity throughout the City of Bellingham and its Urban Growth Area.
- Develop a list of projects that the City can realistically and feasibly implement over the next 10 years while also identifying many important projects that may take longer than 10 years to implement.

The recommended projects include the following:

- New on-street connections (approximately 103.5 linear miles, 196 projects)
- New off-street connections (approximately 21.6 linear miles, 20 projects)³
- New spot improvements (34 projects e.g., enhanced crossings or intersection improvements)
- Upgrades to existing bikeways (approximately 31.9 miles, 46 projects)

IMPLEMENTATION

The City of Bellingham has made significant progress implementing its bicycle network since the adoption of the 2014 Plan. Nearly 60 percent of bikeway and crossing improvements on the 2014 BMP’s prioritized project list have been implemented. Bicycle network projects are implemented in various ways, including as part of a large street overlay or reconstruction project, as part of construction of a new private development project, or as a standalone project. The City’s Transportation Fund (T-Fund)⁴ is a primary source of local funding for bicycle projects and the City has been successful in securing state and federal grants. This Plan’s implementation chapter includes the identification of goal-based priority projects, a discussion of implementation strategies, and performance measures to track implementation over time.

The estimated cost to implement all the projects recommended in the Plan is **\$520,000,000**. The City’s annual funding dedicated to pedestrian and bicycle projects over a 10-year period is approximately \$43,500,000, resulting in a shortfall of about **\$476,500,000**. Therefore, without identifying significant additional revenue sources, the City must prioritize projects and seek other funding partnerships and opportunities to implement more of the project list.

The City’s specific project priorities and partnership opportunities are identified during the annual update of the Six-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The projects and programs included in the Six-year TIP reflect a careful review and synthesis of this Plan, along with the other plans and studies that the City has undertaken to maintain and improve multimodal transportation in Bellingham. The Six-year TIP is then used as the basis for what is funded through the City budgeting process.

In addition, the City will also use this Plan to guide City staff priorities and activities so that they are focused on increasing ridership of bicycles and micromobility by making the transportation system safer, more equitable, and more connected for people who bike and roll. Additionally, the performance measures included in the plan will be used to track progress on plan implementation.

PLAN COMPONENTS

The Plan is organized as follows:

- **Chapter 1:** Introduction presents the Plan goals and progress made on the implementation of the bicycle network. It also summarizes the planning process.
- **Chapter 2:** Community Engagement presents the methods used to engage the public through the planning process and a summary of the input received and how it informed the Plan recommendations.
- **Chapter 3:** Existing Conditions presents a broad overview of current biking conditions in Bellingham.
- **Chapter 4:** Policy Recommendations outlines policies and actions that support achieving the Plan’s goals.
- **Chapter 5:** Bicycle Facility Design and Maintenance provides an overview of existing standards and best practices for bicycle facility design and maintenance, and the design needs of people of all ages and abilities.
- **Chapter 6:** Bicycle Network Recommendations discusses the bicycle network and the project recommendation development process. It describes analyses that were conducted to inform project recommendations and includes maps of recommended projects.
- **Chapter 7:** Programmatic Actions Recommendations outlines recommended programmatic efforts that would support higher rates of cycling in Bellingham.
- **Chapter 8:** Implementation Includes project prioritization criteria, implementation strategies, and performance measures to support the realization of the vision for cycling in Bellingham.

³ Includes some trail segments that are part of the City’s Proposed Trail Network and unimproved rights-of-way segments that provide network value and are not encumbered by environmental constraints.

⁴ The T-Fund is derived from a 2/10 of 1% (0.2%) sales tax, which was approved by Bellingham voters in 2020 for a 10-year period and will remain until December 31, 2030.

space for photo



1 Introduction

Bellingham is a bicycling city. It boasts one of the highest percentages of people biking to work in Washington State and has a robust bicycling culture, which most notably reveals itself during Bike Month and the annual bike parade, but also in its reputation as a mountain biking mecca. It is a community where many people are passionate about building a safer, more connected bicycle network that people of all ages and abilities feel comfortable using. A connected bicycle network that provides safe and comfortable access for people of all ages and abilities can help the city achieve multiple objectives, including improving public health and safety, promoting community and economic vibrancy, advancing transportation equity, and meeting climate action goals. While much work has been done to this end, the City recognizes there is still much work to do and is renewing its commitment to invest in bicycle infrastructure with this update to the Bicycle Master Plan (Plan). The projects recommended in this Plan build on the progress made since it was first adopted in 2014. The focus of this Plan is on filling network gaps and upgrading portions of the existing network to make bicycling an attractive way to get around for a broad spectrum of the community.

BICYCLE NETWORK IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

The 2014 Plan defines a 170-mile Primary Bicycle Network and identifies 229 bikeway crossing improvements on a prioritized project list. Since 2014, the City has implemented 124, or 54%, of the total 2014 Plan projects.⁵ Table 2 presents a summary of bikeway and crossing improvements that have been implemented since 2014.

The City Council annually approves Transportation Funds for active transportation projects that have been approved in the Bicycle Master Plan and the Pedestrian Master Plan and recommended for construction by Public Works and the Transportation Commission. Most of these bicycle improvements have been constructed with T-Funds, but some bikeways are constructed with other funds, such as grants, partnerships, and mitigation funds.

Progress on Plan project implementation is reported in the Primary Bicycle Network Completeness chapter of Bellingham’s [Transportation Reports on Annual Mobility \(TRAM\)](#), the annual progress report on transportation projects. The TRAM provides a detailed look at projects completed.

Equity in Project Implementation

The 2014 Plan established equity as a goal, aiming to provide bicycling access for all through equity in public engagement, service delivery, and capital investment. Equity, measured by high concentrations of populations under 18 and high concentrations of low-income populations, was one of four weighted variables that made up the project prioritization methodology. Between 2011 and 2023, 76.7% of T-fund and 68% of non-T-Fund bikeway improvements have been in low to moderate income neighborhoods.

Table 2: 2014 Plan Bikeway and Crossing Improvements Implementation Progress


| Bikeway Improvements | Tier 1 | Tier 2 | Tier 3 | Total |
|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| Total Bikeway Projects | 24 | 57 | 122 | 203 |
| Projects Completed | 18 | 35 | 53 | 106 |
| Projects Not Yet Completed | 6 | 22 | 69 | 97 |
| Percent Completed | 75% | 61% | 43% | 52% |

| Crossing Improvements | |
|----------------------------|----------------|
| Total Crossing Projects | 26 |
| Projects Completed | 18 |
| Projects Not Yet Completed | 6 ¹ |
| Percent Completed | 70% |

¹ Includes 2 crossing projects funded for construction in 2024 and 2025.

League of American Bicycle Friendly Communities

The League of American Bicyclists’ Bicycle Friendly Community Program (BFC) provides a roadmap to improve conditions for bicycling as well as incentives, hands-on assistance, and award recognition for communities that actively support bicycling. A BFC welcomes bicyclists by providing safe accommodation for bicycling and encouraging people to bike for transportation and recreation. Bellingham achieved Silver-level status under this program in 2007 and, being recognized for its continued efforts to prioritize bike infrastructure and network connectivity, was promoted to Gold-level status in 2020, taking its place as only one of two cities in the nation promoted from Silver to Gold that year. By focusing on implementing the recommendations in this plan, Bellingham can continue to improve upon its BFC designation and work towards being one of only a few cities that have achieved Platinum status.



⁵ 2023 Transportation Report on Annual Mobility



2 Community Engagement

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PROCESS

Purpose

The Bicycle Master Plan is a plan that is *by* Bellingham, *for* Bellingham. While technical analysis is important to structuring an updated bikeway network, the backbone of the Plan is the lived, on-the-ground experience of Bellingham residents and the vision of the Bellingham community. The recommendations included in this Plan were identified, shaped, and prioritized with help and direction from the Bellingham community. The planning process included an extensive engagement effort that used a variety of in-person and online strategies to hear from as many community members as possible, including community members with the most barriers for bicycling.

Outreach Strategy: Empowering the vision through community feedback

A two-phase engagement strategy ensured community voices shaped the entire Plan update process. Phase one prioritized broad participation from a wide range of perspectives, feeding valuable insights to the technical team as they crafted the initial Plan recommendations. The second phase engaged with a smaller, yet deeply invested segment of the community to scrutinize the draft Plan recommendations and offer feedback. This ensures the final recommendations not only reflect the initial vision, but also stand the test of rigorous in-depth analysis.

Public Input Phasing

DISCOVERY PHASE: Listening to the community

The Discovery Phase was focused on listening to the Bellingham community and understanding perceptions around biking in Bellingham, safety concerns and what is needed to make biking safer, more comfortable, and more convenient. The focus was to gather a broad swath of the community ideas and feedback on how to create a seamlessly connected biking network.

Quick, easy, accessible:

The goal of this phase was to get a high volume of engagement that was quick, easy, and had a low barrier of participation. Priority was to capture every perspective during the planning process, from seasoned cyclists to concerned drivers.

Casting a wide net:

To ensure inclusivity, a diverse toolbox of engagement methods was used:

- Open House: Learn from project experts, brainstorm ideas or concerns on maps and talk with experts in a welcoming space.
- Technical Review Committees: Focused discussions with interest groups like cyclists and business owners.
- Online Survey: A convenient platform to capture insights from the comfort of home.
- Interactive Web Mapping: Plot biking routes and visualize the city's potential.
- Pop-Up Tabling: Bringing the conversation directly to community events.
- Engage Bellingham Online Platform: A digital hub for ongoing feedback and collaboration.

From voices to vision:

The feedback from this phase was used as the foundation for the draft network, policies, prioritization, and actions. Merged with the technical analysis, the first draft was a roadmap for a more connected community.

DEVELOPMENT PHASE: Shaping the future, together

The Plan Development phase was about gathering feedback on the proposed projects, policies, and program recommendations. The focus for outreach was sharpened during this phase while still providing opportunities for the wider community to participate. Residents and groups that had signed up for updates, had a vested interest in the plan, and had more in-depth insights that helped refine the recommendations. Reviewing the draft Plan is time consuming and the scope of what was asked from the public was much narrower. The aim of the second phase was to get feedback that will help refine the plan, rather than to solicit new ideas for projects or policies.

Tools to Collect Feedback:

- Interactive Story Map - online resource designed so that community members could explore the vision on a digital map, leave comments, and see how the plan takes shape.
- Targeted Surveys - specific questions that allowed residents to dive into specific aspects of the plan and provide feedback.
- Virtual Open Houses - video call where interested community members could join the project team to ask questions and share thoughts live.
- Engage Bellingham - an online platform, which is used for many City outreach efforts, that helps keep the dialogue going anytime, anywhere.
- Technical Review Committees - local experts with whom City staff specifically reached out and reconnected with to fine-tune the details.

Technical Review Committees

In addition to the input from the wider community, we also held meetings with Technical Review Committees to get more in-depth feedback and ideas for the plan. Each group had a special interest and expertise regarding biking in Bellingham and was comprised of leaders within various engaged subsets of the community. These groups came to the table with a specialized expertise and were asked to give feedback specific to the groups that they each represent. The project team provided deeper dive presentations and solicited feedback in both the discovery and development phases of the plan.

- The Adaptive and Inclusive Recreation Project of Whatcom County (AIROW)
- Mount Baker Bicycle Club (MBBC)
- Walk and Roll Bellingham
- Bellingham Chamber of Commerce
- Port of Bellingham



ENGAGEMENT REACH

582
SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

1072
WEBMAP COMMENTS

Pop-up Event Attendees:
12 DIRECT PARTICIPANTS,
40+ COMMUNITY INTERACTIONS

TOTAL
WEBMAP/SURVEY INTERACTIONS:
1,440 IN PHASE I
312 IN PHASE II

212
EMAILS AND COMMENTS TO THE CITY

7 TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE MEETINGS AND
20 ATTENDEES (both phases)

KEY FINDINGS FROM COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT

A community survey revealed that a connected network of streets that felt safe for biking were the top factors that would improve people's experience and lead them to choose to ride a bike more (Figure 2). The survey also revealed a strong preference for protected or separated bike lanes, particularly for those people riding with children (Figure 3).

Figure 2: - Community Survey:

Which of the following would improve your experience and/or lead you to choose to ride a bike more in Bellingham?





Figure 3: Community Survey:

Which of the following on-street bikeways would you feel comfortable biking on?



Across the different engagement channels, key themes emerged that provided insight on shared experiences and suggestions for improving the bicycle network. These key themes are summarized in Table 3 below along with an explanation of how these themes shaped the Plan. A full summary of community and stakeholder engagement activities and the input received is included in Appendix A.

Table 3: Summary of Public Input Themes and How They Shaped the Plan Update

| What the Bellingham Community Said | How It Shaped the Plan |
|--|--|
| <p>Need for Higher Comfort Bikeways</p> <p>Results from the survey, webmap, and pop-up event all demonstrate the community's expressed desire for the addition of higher comfort bikeways such as separated (or protected) bike lanes, bike boulevards, and trails throughout the city. Biking is a popular mode of transportation in Bellingham, and public input suggests that a connected network of high comfort bike lanes would encourage more people to ride a bike.</p> | <p>The proposed bikeway network recommends high comfort bikeways that will attract a broader spectrum of bicyclists and micromobility users, including bicycle boulevards, separated bike lanes, and multi-use trails. It also recommends upgrading many of Bellingham's standard and buffered bike lanes to higher comfort bikeways, where feasible or in line with future development. Locations where people identified the need for bike lanes were assessed, and in most cases, included in the bicycle network recommendations. Policy 1.1, Policy 4.1, and all policies under the connectivity goal focus on providing access to more destinations via an all ages and abilities bikeway network.</p> |
| <p>Safety at Intersections and Street Crossings</p> <p>A desire to feel safe while navigating intersections and crossing the street was a common theme among the public input received. Safer street design, dedicated bicycle crossings, pedestrian and cyclist bridges, improved signage, traffic calming, increased visibility, and the addition and enforcement of "no turn on red" signals are mentioned as potential improvements for safer street crossings.</p> | <p>Intersections that were reported as feeling unsafe were taken note of, analyzed, and most were included in the bikeway network spot recommendations. Many more crossing/intersection project recommendations were included as projects in the Pedestrian Master Plan. Furthermore, the Pedestrian and Bicycle Design Toolbox provides guidance on appropriate strategies that can be deployed to improve the safety and comfort of people crossing the street and biking through intersections.</p> |
| <p>More Education and Enforcement of Motorists</p> <p>Community members expressed feeling unsafe while biking due to motorists exceeding the speed limit, not looking for bikes when turning, and merging conflicts. There were several requests to lower speed limits on certain streets, including Old Woburn St, Electric Ave, Iowa St, and James St. Other solutions recommended by respondents included adding "no parking," "no turn on red," "share the road," or "yield to bicyclists" signage.</p> | <p>Programmatic actions include conducting a citywide speed study to determine where posted speeds should be lowered and what strategies are needed to align design speed with target (posted) speed. Another programmatic action is focused on promoting a safety culture and educating motorists on safe driving behavior around people walking, rolling, and biking.</p> |

| What the Bellingham Community Said | How It Shaped the Plan |
|---|---|
| <p>Missing Links</p> <p>Over 100 webmap and survey comments identified missing links in the bicycle network, including bike lanes ending abruptly, incomplete trails, and barriers to crossing busy streets. Several comments mention I-5 acting as a barrier to easily getting to their destination and suggest adding an underpass or overpass for cyclists and pedestrians to get across.</p> | <p>A goal of the plan update is to increase connectivity. Network recommendations include spot improvements at intersections to address dropped bike lanes and new on- and off-street connections to close network gaps. Recommendations also include enhancements to crossings of I-5, including a potential new crossing at E Maple St. Policies under the Connectivity goal call for improving routes to parks, schools, transit, businesses, and employment to create a connected and safe bicycle network throughout Bellingham.</p> |
| <p>Bike Parking</p> <p>Respondents expressed a need for safe and secure bike parking, especially around the city center. There are requests for bike parking at retail centers, sports fields, trailheads, medical centers, recreational facilities, and according to one comment, "anywhere there is car parking."</p> | <p>Requests for the addition and improvement of bike parking were used to inform policy and program recommendations, including Policy 4.5 and a programmatic action focused on providing more short- and long-term bike parking and establishing a bike parking program.</p> |
| <p>Maintenance</p> <p>Public input indicated a desire for improved City of Bellingham maintenance of bicycle facilities including debris removal, repair of pavement, and restriping of worn bicycle facility markings. Other requests included a desire for more seasonal maintenance, including prioritizing snow removal of the bicycle network facilities and the provision of temporary bicycle facility routes with same level of protection and wayfinding/warning signage when off-street or protected bike routes are closed due to construction or maintenance activities.</p> | <p>The Plan includes a section on maintenance and Policy 1.7, which underscore the importance of dedicating more resources to maintenance as the City grows its bikeway network and implements more separated bike lanes, which have unique maintenance needs.</p> |



3 Existing Conditions

Bellingham was incorporated in 1903 and consolidated four settlements along Bellingham Bay: Bellingham, Whatcom, Fairhaven, and Sehome. These areas, which include Downtown and surrounding neighborhoods, generally have a well-connected grid street pattern, which provides more low-stress bicycle connections. Conversely, areas of the City located to the east and north that were annexed later have less dense road networks with less connectivity, which presents some bicycle access challenges and often results in busier arterial roadways being the only option for bicyclists.

I-5 divides these two parts of the city and acts as a barrier between the older part of the community and the newer parts of the city due to the lack of connections to safely cross the freeway. Also, many of these connections involve arterial streets and freeway interchanges which have higher vehicle traffic volumes and speeds.

Additionally, many parts of Bellingham have natural barriers, such as streams and wetlands or hilly terrain, which limit connectivity and can present a physical challenge to many would-be bicyclists.

ON-STREET BIKE NETWORK

Bellingham has approximately 96 miles of on-street bike network consisting of a variety of bikeway types that include: bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, buffered bike lanes, separated bike lanes, climbing lanes, paved shoulders, and shared lane markings.

Bike lane

Bike lanes are on-street bicycle facilities designated by striping, signage, and bicycle symbol pavement markings. They are separated from car traffic by a solid white line. Approximately 38 percent of Bellingham’s bicycle network is currently made up of bike lanes.

Bicycle Boulevard

Bicycle boulevards are low-stress bikeways installed on residential streets that have low vehicle speeds (20-25 mph) and low vehicle traffic volumes (less than 2,000 vehicles per day). Bike boulevards make up approximately 21 percent of the existing bikeway network. While in some cases bicycle boulevards may be less direct than an arterial bike lane, they generally provide a more comfortable route for people on bikes.

Buffered Bike Lane

Buffered bike lanes are bike lanes with a painted buffer that creates additional lateral separation of the bike lane from either the vehicle travel lane or adjacent parking lane, or both. Approximately 6 percent of the existing bikeway network consists of buffered bicycle lanes.

Separated Bike Lane

Separated bicycle lanes (also called “protected bike lanes” or “cycle tracks”) are a type of bikeway that provides an exclusive space for bicyclists along or within a roadway. Separation from motor vehicles includes two fundamental elements. First, horizontal separation with physical space (e.g., a landscape buffer) between the street and the bicycle lane (this may include a change in elevation from the street surface). Second, a vertical element like a jersey barrier or pylons separating the bicycle lane from the vehicle travel lane and from the pedestrian facility (this may include a change in elevation, or a change in surface material). Separated bicycle lanes may be one-way or two way. Currently only about one percent of Bellingham’s bikeway network is separated bike lanes, but this number is anticipated to

grow significantly with the implementation of this plan.

Climbing Lane

A climbing lane is a bike lane in only the uphill direction. The downhill direction has shared lane markings on the road to indicate to motorists that bicyclists are sharing the lane. These are typically used where space constraints or other factors such as limited sight lines make a downhill bike lane infeasible. Nearly three percent of the bikeway network is climbing lanes.

Paved Shoulder

Paved shoulders are not dedicated bikeways (cars can pull into shoulders in case of emergency or mechanical failure) but provide space for bicyclists to ride separate from vehicle traffic. Paved shoulders exist along portions of SR 542 and in a few other corridors, comprising about 13 percent of the network.

Shared Lane Marking

Shared lane markings are not officially a bikeway type but are used in segments where a dedicated bikeway may be difficult to implement due to space or other constraints. They are typically reserved for short segments and are best used as wayfinding devices where vehicle speeds and traffic are low.


Figure 4: Granary Ave Separated Bike Lane (Cycle Track)



Table 4: Existing Bicycle Network Mileage

| Facility Type | 2013 | 2023 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Bike Lanes | 31.9 | 42.4 |
| Bike Boulevards | 0.0 | 23.4 |
| Paved Shoulder | 5.7 | 14.4 |
| Multi-use Trails | - | 13.6 |
| Buffered Bike Lanes | 0.0 | 6.9 |
| Shared Lane Markings | 0.4 | 4.5 |
| Climbing Lanes | 0.7 | 3.2 |
| Separated Bike Lanes/ Cycle Track | 0.0 | 1.1 |
| Total | 38.7 | 109.6 |

Figure 5: Existing Bicycle Network



Existing Bikeways

- Separated Bike Lanes
- Bike Lanes*
- Bike Boulevard
- Multi-Use Trail
- Shared Lane Markings
- Paved Shoulder
- Public School
- Urban Growth Area
- Urban Village
- Park

*Bike Lanes include buffered bike lanes and climbing lanes

Trails and Greenways

Bellingham has a robust system of multi-use trails that provides opportunities for recreation and transportation. The City's Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PRO) Plan recommends an interconnected system of high-quality, accessible multi-use trails and greenway corridors, and points to an ever-growing demand for more off-road walking and bicycling trails especially as the Bellingham community expands to the north. Some trails may serve both a recreation and transportation function. Major trail corridors that serve

as an alternative to on-street bicycle facilities include the Railroad, Whatcom Creek, South Bay/Boulevard Park, and Interurban Trails. Throughout the City there are also short trail connections at the neighborhood scale that allow bicyclists to circumvent barriers and ride between on-street facilities.

Trails aim to be accessible for all, and the PRO Plan sets a goal of continuing to explore new trail surface alternatives that balance the natural character of Bellingham's trail system with accessibility requirements.

Figure 6: E Kellogg Road Multi-use Trail



Transit and First/Last Mile Connections

Walking and biking are fundamental travel modes people use to connect to transit. Providing safe and direct bicycle connections to and from transit greatly expands the reach of transit while allowing for more regional trips to start and end by bicycle. The Whatcom Transportation Authority (WTA) provides transit services to Bellingham and greater Whatcom County. It equips each of its fixed route buses with bike racks that can carry up to three bikes. The WTA and City have been working together to create better bicycle connections to transit and provide more bike parking at key transit stops.

Schools

Schools generate large numbers of trips, many of which could be taken by bicycle. The Bellingham School District serves over 10,000 students at 13 elementary schools, four middle schools, and four high schools. Improving bicycle connections to these schools and providing education and encouragement programs can increase bicycling rates, which has the positive benefits of improving safety for all and decreasing vehicle emissions by decreasing motor vehicle trips and congestion around schools.

There are three post-secondary institutions in Bellingham:

- Western Washington University is located south of downtown with over 14,000 students.
- Whatcom Community College, with 7,000 two-year program students and upwards of 12,000 students attending throughout the year, is located in the northern portion of the City in the Cordata neighborhood.
- Bellingham Technical College, located in the Birchwood neighborhood, currently has over 8,000 students attending classes.

These institutions are also major employment centers and generate significant trips, many of which can be made by bicycle or bicycle and transit.

Supporting Plans and Studies

The City has completed several plans and studies that support further development of the bicycle network to improve safety and accessibility:

- The [Bellingham Comprehensive Plan](#) (2016) included goals and actions focused on improving bicycle access through capital improvements, development requirements, street standards, and equity in engagement, service delivery, and investment. The Comprehensive Plan will be updated in 2025 and will incorporate this Plan.
- The [Six-year Transportation Improvement Program \(TIP\)](#) identifies major transportation projects planned for the next six years, including bicycle projects, Safe Routes to School improvements, and other major projects to improve multimodal safety and connectivity. The TIP is updated annually.
- The [Bellingham Local Road Safety Plan](#) (LRSP) analyzes crash data citywide to identify common crash factors and locations. It identifies existing and proposed safety improvements at the locations of fatal or severe injury crashes, prioritizes locations for countermeasure implementation, and identifies other citywide traffic safety measures including streetlight upgrades and speed limit reductions. Projects identified in the LRSP are prioritized for inclusion in the TIP so they can be funded, designed and constructed. The LRSP is updated every two years.
- Recent [Transportation and Corridor Studies](#), including the Lincoln-Lakeway Multimodal Transportation Study (2020-2021), Meridian-Girard Multimodal Safety Improvements (2020-2022), Parkview Elementary Safe Route to School Improvements (2020-2022), Kentucky-Nevada-Texas Bike Boulevard (2021), West Illinois Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Improvements (2020), James Street Multimodal Feasibility Study (2019), and Meridian Street Roundabouts Feasibility Study (2019) provide analysis and design guidance for specific locations and corridors. Many of these studies have led to successful grant applications and ultimately construction through the TIP. There are still some projects identified in these studies that have not been implemented and are referenced in the Plan project recommendations.

- **Urban Village and other Subarea Plans**, including the [Downtown Bellingham Plan](#) (2014), [Waterfront District Subarea Plan](#) (2019), [Fairhaven Neighborhood and Urban Village Plan](#) (2012), [Samish Way Urban Village Subarea Plan](#) (2019), [Fountain District Subarea Plan](#) (2020), and [Old Town Subarea Plan](#) (2008) provide policy frameworks for development in their respective neighborhoods, often including bicycle improvements such as crossing improvements, traffic calming, and new sidewalks.
- The [Parks, Recreation and Open Space \(PRO\) Plan](#) (2021) includes information about and a plan for continued trail development, which is an integral part of Bellingham's pedestrian and bicycle networks. The PRO Plan is discussed under "Trails" above.

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

The project team performed two technical data analyses to measure the comfort and connectivity of Bellingham's existing bikeway network. Analysis was carried out on both the existing network and on the full build-out of the 2014 Plan network recommendations.

Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)

LTS analysis assigns all road segments a score of 1 for lowest stress, to 4 for highest stress. Scores are based on roadway factors like posted speed limit, number of lanes, traffic volumes, and the presence and type of bike facilities. The analysis revealed high-stress corridors that may be targets for infrastructure modifications or identification of parallel, low-stress routes.

The LTS analysis revealed that the ten most stressful (LTS 4) corridors for bicyclists are:

- F Street (W Holly St to Cornwall Ave)
- James Street (Ohio St to Illinois St)
- Meridian Street (Illinois to Broadway; Squalicum Way to City Limits)
- Alabama Street (James to Electric Ave)
- Iowa Street (James to Woburn)
- Woburn Street (north of Texas St)
- Holly Street (Broadway to Ellis)
- Lakeway Drive (Ellis to Puget)
- N Garden Street (Palm St to Holly St)
- Bennett Drive (Airport Dr to Marine Dr)

There are many more corridors that are LTS 3 which are considered higher stress for most bicyclists. While some LTS 3 and 4 corridors currently have bike facilities, most do not. In fact, about 32 percent of the existing bicycle network is considered high-stress (LTS 3 or 4). Many of these high-stress corridors are included in the recommended bicycle network, or parallel bikeways or multi-use trails are being recommended to provide comparable connectivity and access.


Bicycle Network Analysis (BNA)

Bicycle Network Analysis (BNA) captures the importance of the interconnectedness of bicycle routes by measuring access to destinations. BNA assigns all census blocks in the city a score of 0 to 100 based on the number of destinations accessible via the low-stress bike network, relative to the number of destinations via all roads. The "low-stress network" is defined as streets with LTS scores of 1 or 2. Destinations included in BNA analysis are schools, retail, and transit; they are sourced from OpenStreetMap. One of the limitations of BNA, however, is that it does not factor in topography.

The Plan update recommends facilities on the following routes through areas with low and medium-low BNA scores:

- New connection in north Bellingham along Horton Road, Deemer Road (future extension), Stuart Road, Tull Road (future extension), Kellogg Road, and Deemer Road between Guide Meridian and Telegraph Road
- Completing the east-west bikeway on Kellogg Road between Cordata Parkway and James Street
- James Street between Van Wyck Road and Orchard Street
- New and upgraded bikeway on Bakerview Road between Airport Road and Hannegan Road
- New and upgraded bikeway on Lakeway Drive (or on nearby parallel corridors), east of Woburn Street
- New bike lanes on 36th Street, Fielding Ave, and 32nd Street Between Samish Way and Donovan Avenue

Figure 7: Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress Analysis of the Bellingham Street Network



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Level of Traffic Stress (LTS)

- LTS 1
- LTS 2
- LTS 3
- LTS 4
- Public School
- Urban Growth Area
- Urban Village
- Park





4 Policy Recommendations

The 2014 Plan presented nine goals with a variety of policies and actions to attain those goals. For this Plan update, these goals and policies have been reassessed to ensure they align with the City's goals as articulated in other planning documents, meet the primary desires and expectations of the community, and are actionable. These recommended policies will inform the way infrastructure improvements are made and guide other actions the City and its partners take to create safe, equitable, and connected biking conditions in Bellingham. The updated set of policy recommendations are categorized under four goals focused on safety, equity, connectivity, and increasing ridership.



Goal 1: Safety

Improve bicyclist and micromobility user safety and comfort through well-designed bikeways and by promoting safe driving, walking, and bicycling behaviors.

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Policy 1.1 | Separated bikeways, multi-use trails, and bicycle boulevards are the preferred bikeways for all new and upgraded bikeways. The City will document justifications for installing other bikeway types in cases where a separated bikeway is deemed infeasible (i.e., costs outweigh the potential benefit). |
| Policy 1.2 | Use proven safety countermeasures such as speed management strategies, separated bike lanes, and signal strategies (e.g., leading bicycle/pedestrian intervals, protected left-turns) to proactively reduce the number and severity of bicyclist collisions. |
| Policy 1.3 | Work with the Police Department to ensure that officers: a) are trained in the most current laws to protect people walking, rolling, and bicycling, and b) use modern technology such as automated safety cameras to reduce speeding, red light running, and potentially other infractions as enabled by Washington State law. |
| Policy 1.4 | Coordinate efforts between Public Works, Parks, Planning, and Police Departments to ensure consistent messaging and education for bicyclists and motorists when implementing new bikeways. |
| Policy 1.5 | Partner with agencies and organizations to educate and raise awareness about laws and rights of cyclists. |
| Policy 1.6 | Ensure adequate provision of street lighting to increase personal security and safety for bicyclists and micromobility users. |
| Policy 1.7 | Allocate additional resources to the City's maintenance program to ensure a growing network of bike lanes, particularly separated bike lanes, are routinely swept and kept clear of sand, glass, and debris at least bi-monthly (6 times/year), more frequently for seasonal maintenance (e.g., leaf drop, snow) or in response to community requests. |



Goal 2: Equity

Build a bicycle network that serves people of all ages, abilities, and economic means.

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Policy 2.1 | Provide diverse opportunities for all residents to participate in making Bellingham a human-scaled community. Whenever possible, engage vision- and hearing-impaired, non-English speakers, and people with mobility challenges by providing technology, translated materials, and interpreters at public events. |
| Policy 2.2 | Ensure easy access to the bikeway network for all residents of Bellingham, including people of different ages, races, ethnicities, incomes, and those with variable or restricted mobility. |
| Policy 2.3 | Prioritize bikeway network investments in underserved communities. |





Goal 3: Connectivity

Complete a citywide network of all ages and abilities bikeways that connect homes, jobs, shopping, schools, services, and recreation areas.

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| Policy 3.1 | Improve bicycle and micromobility access to employment destinations, schools, transit, healthy food choices, healthcare facilities, and support services throughout the city to allow people of all ages and abilities to use a bike to meet their everyday needs. |
| Policy 3.2 | Improve routes to overcome major barriers. Work with WSDOT to fund, implement, and maintain short- and long-term recommendations for improving crossings of I-5, state routes, and on- and off-ramps to these facilities. |
| Policy 3.3 | Connect the City's multi-use trail network with the on-street bikeway network. Work with the Parks and Recreation Department to ensure multi-use trail design and trail etiquette messaging is in place to minimize conflicts between bicyclists and other trail users. |
| Policy 3.4 | Partner with the Bellingham School District and seek Safe Routes to School (SRTS) funding to improve bicycle infrastructure around all schools; and to develop school safety and encouragement programs. |



Goal 4: Increase Ridership

Increase the percentage of trips made by bicycle and micromobility to support Bellingham's Climate Action Plan and promote a healthy Bellingham.

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| Policy 4.1 | Increase the availability of all ages and abilities bicycle infrastructure to encourage more people to bicycle and improve the health of Bellingham residents, help achieve transportation mode shift goals, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions from car trips. |
| Policy 4.2 | Create a bikeway network that is easy to use through intuitive, people-first design that considers the operating characteristics of bicyclists (including those riding larger cargo or adaptive bikes) and micromobility users, provides bicycle advantage (e.g., re-orienting stop signs to cross traffic on bike boulevards, signal detection), and incorporates other features such as lean rails, where appropriate. |
| Policy 4.3 | Make the bikeway network (including multi-use trails integral to the bikeway network) easy and intuitive to navigate using wayfinding signs and pavement markings and up-to-date route information via online apps |
| Policy 4.4 | Continue to include bicycle and pedestrian improvement recommendations when developing capital improvement program project lists. |
| Policy 4.5 | Establish a bike parking program focused on working with the business community and other stakeholders to provide secure parking where it is most needed to meet demand and encourage bicycle trips. Update bicycle parking guidelines to ensure the needs of larger bikes, cargo bikes, and e-bikes are met. |
| Policy 4.6 | Work with Planning and Community Development to reduce vehicle parking requirements for new development in exchange for long-term, secure bicycle parking following established bike parking guidelines. |





5 Bicycle Facility Design and Maintenance

DESIGN NEEDS OF BICYCLISTS

While many factors contribute to whether people choose to ride a bicycle for trips like commuting to work or school, or taking care of their everyday needs, one of the biggest considerations is safety and comfort. Many potential users of the bikeway network have low tolerance for sharing roadways with cars. Bikeway designs should focus on user comfort so people are not deterred by stress, anxiety, or safety concerns. When planning and designing bikeways, it is important to recognize that not all people bicycling feel comfortable on every type of bikeway. A bicycle network that addresses the needs of all types of bicyclists, and encourages more people to bicycle, is comprised of low-stress bikeways that are connected, comfortable, and appealing to both new and experienced bicyclists of all ages. The [Bicycle and Pedestrian Toolbox](#) was developed to provide guidance on best design practices of bikeways and pedestrian facilities.


National research indicates that bicyclists are better understood as being part of a spectrum⁶ (see Figure 8). At one end of the spectrum are those comfortable riding with traffic in almost any condition; on the other end are people who might not bike at all if bikeways are not comfortable enough for them. In Figure 8, the four types of bicyclists are defined as follows:

- 1. Highly confident bicyclists** will ride in any road conditions or environment. These types of bicyclists include adults who regularly commute by bicycle and bicyclists who are willing to ride on roads with little to no dedicated bicycle infrastructure.
- 2. Somewhat confident bicyclists** will ride comfortably on most types of streets but may be uncomfortable in certain situations or some road conditions.
- 3. Interested but concerned bicyclists** require physical bicycle infrastructure improvements before they will want to ride. They typically do not feel comfortable sharing the lane with motor vehicles or riding adjacent to high-speed and high-volume traffic. This group represents the largest share of the population and typically includes children, the elderly, and non-regular adult bicyclists. These riders prefer separated or off-street bicycle facilities or bicycling on low speed, low-volume streets.

4. Non-bicyclists are people who will not (or cannot) ride a bicycle, no matter the circumstance. It is important to understand which type of cyclist is most likely or most desired to use any given facility, as this will affect the design and degree of separation from vehicle traffic necessary. All ages and abilities bikeways are designed for all bicyclists to travel safely and comfortably.

The Plan aims to install as many low stress facilities as possible, so that the network can truly be for all ages and abilities and include Interested but concerned cyclists. Research shows that it is equally important to create a connected bicycle network for increasing bicycle ridership. A connected bicycle network is one without localized gaps (e.g., dropped bike lanes at intersections) that provides the most direct access to the destinations people want to go. To maximize bicycle ridership a connected network of low-stress, all ages and abilities bikeways is important.

Figure 8: Comfort Typology of Bicyclists



Designing with the Safe System Approach

In the US there has been increased focus on the Safe System Approach, which is modeled on international best practices for creating a transportation system that is human-centered and proactive in mitigating risks, particularly to vulnerable road users such as people walking, rolling, and biking. The Safe System Approach works to achieve zero fatal and serious injury crashes by creating multiple layers of protection to both prevent crashes from happening in the first place, and reduce the harm caused to those involved when crashes do happen.

Key Principles of the Safe Systems Approach

People Make Mistakes - So, our transportation system should be designed and operated to accommodate inevitable mistakes and to avoid death and severe injuries.

People Are Vulnerable - We should design and operate our transportation system to recognize and accommodate human vulnerabilities.

Safety is Proactive - Strategies should proactively identify and mitigate risks in the transportation system, rather than waiting for crashes to occur before reacting.



⁶ Dill, Jennifer and Nathan McNeil. Revisiting the Four Types of Cyclists: Findings from a National Survey. In Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, Issue 2587, Washington, DC, 2016.

E-Bikes

The use of E-bikes is growing rapidly due to advantages and benefits such as increased speed and range, assistance with pedaling, particularly in hilly terrain and for heavier loads, improved accessibility, and health benefits. E-bikes can provide a practical solution for replacing cars for commuting and running errands. There are a wide range of e-bike options available, including those that are highly utilitarian with large carrying capacities, those with three wheels, those that have off-road capabilities, and those that can be folded up for easy transport.

The State of Washington categorizes e-bikes into three classifications:

- **E-bike Class 1:** A bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling and that ceases to assist when the bicycle reaches 20 mph.
- **E-bike Class 2:** A bicycle equipped with a motor that may be used exclusively to propel the bicycle and that is not capable of providing assistance when the bicycle reaches a speed of 20 mph.
- **E-bike Class 3:** A bicycle equipped with a motor that provides assistance only when the rider is pedaling and ceases to assist when the bicycle reaches a top speed of 28 mph and is equipped with a speedometer.

E-bikes have the potential to greatly increase bicycle ridership and replace many car trips. As e-bikes become increasingly popular, it is essential to accommodate them within Bellingham's transportation network so as not to undermine all ages and abilities facilities. Given the higher speeds of e-bikes it is important to design wider bikeways to accommodate passing, particularly in more heavily traveled corridors or uphill directions.

E-bikes on multi-use trails can cause conflicts with pedestrians and other slower moving users, requiring management or consideration of other bikeway types or design strategies. In addition, bike parking facilities should accommodate e-bikes by having more roll-up instead of lift-up bike storage, providing universal public charging, and having enough space for non-standard bikes.

MAINTENANCE

Bikeway maintenance is critical to bicyclist and micromobility user safety and comfort. Designing bikeways to reduce maintenance needs, giving attention to sweeping the sides of streets where bicyclists ride, and ensuring that riding surfaces are relatively smooth are all requisites in attracting more of the public to bicycling.

Maintenance of the bicycle network is typically done through routine roadway maintenance, or park maintenance, as is the case of many (though not all) multi-use trails. Maintenance activities generally fall into two categories: routine maintenance and seasonal maintenance.

Public comments received during Plan development underscored the importance of consistent, ongoing maintenance to the safety and comfort of bicyclists and micromobility users.



Routine Maintenance

Routine cleaning and clearing of debris, as well as more significant repairs, are required to keep bike facilities safe and comfortable year-round. Small rocks, branches, glass, and other debris often accumulate in bike facilities. A pothole or uneven longitudinal cracks that a car can drive seamlessly over can cause bicycle wheel damage or the bicyclist to lose control. Such conditions can result in unsafe conditions for cyclists and discourage people from using the facility.

Landscape Maintenance

Landscape maintenance is important for the quality of the bicycle infrastructure and the user experience. Unmaintained vegetation, trash, and other obstacles in the urban landscape can block sightlines and increase risks for all users. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles should be considered when designing and maintaining bicycle and micromobility infrastructure. Landscape maintenance is the responsibility of both City and private property owners depending on whether the area is in a public right of way, public land, or private property.

Other Routine Maintenance

Maintenance of signs and pavement markings and other traffic control devices is critical for the safety of all road users, but also ensures that bicyclists can easily navigate the network and bikeway facilities are visible and well understood by all. It is also critical to maintain drainage facilities since bikeways are often on the roadway edge where drainage also occurs. Keeping catch basins clear of debris, particularly in the fall, prevents pooling of water within bikeways.

Seasonal Maintenance

To ensure year-round safe bicycle network access, maintenance of bikeways needs to be performed routinely and systematically, and be responsive to seasonal conditions. Debris, sand, leaves, ice, snow, and vegetation can create hazardous biking conditions and should be removed as promptly and as thoroughly as practicable.



Maintenance of Separated Bike Lanes

Separated bike lanes have particular maintenance needs that may require the City to modify its maintenance practices and level of funding dedicated to bikeway maintenance. Routine sweeping of separated bike lanes is necessary and may require specialized equipment. A smaller utility vehicle with an articulated sweeper or plow can be more effective at clearing debris and snow than conventional equipment.

The physical barriers used on separated bicycle lanes also require maintenance. Some barrier solutions will last longer than others, but all will have a life cycle and need repair or replacement. While it can be more expensive and labor-intensive to maintain separated bike lanes, the City should continue to invest in maintenance, particularly as it grows its separated bike lane network, to ensure a safe and comfortable system for all ages and abilities.



6 Bicycle Network Recommendations

Project Recommendation Development Process

Bicycle network recommendations reflect findings from a data-driven network analysis as well as input received from public and stakeholder engagement, the Transportation Commission, and City staff. Technical analysis included an assessment of level of traffic stress and network connectivity. Public input received during the Discovery Phase of the planning process was combined with the technical analysis to identify locations where improvements would provide better connectivity, safety, and comfort. These location-based needs were then assessed to determine the appropriate design solution and feasibility. This assessment informed draft project recommendations, which were then presented to the public. Finally, feedback received from the public and other stakeholders provided direction for refining the draft project recommendations to a final list of projects. Figure 9 shows the project development process.

BICYCLE NETWORK AND PROJECT RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommended updates to the bicycle network consist of new on- and off-street connections as well as upgrades to existing bikeways to achieve a higher comfort and safer experience for people of all ages and abilities. Recommendations are focused on creating a complete network, including better integration of the on-street network with multi-use trails, better connections over I-5, and improved street crossings and intersection treatments. Table 5 provides a summary of bicycle network project recommendations as shown in Figures 10-13.

Per [Policy 1.1](#), the City will prioritize building higher comfort bikeways that provide separation from motor vehicles and/or integrate traffic calming to reduce vehicle speeds unless it is deemed infeasible, or in conflict with other objectives such as maintaining reliable transit service and freight access. This commitment means potentially longer timeframes for securing funding, and in some cases, involve trade-offs related to how street space is allocated (e.g., on-street parking). In many cases, recommendations could be implemented using “quick-build” materials such as flex posts and tough curbs to achieve the desired bikeway at a lower cost until funding can be secured for more permanent infrastructure. These types of installations have maintenance requirements, which need to be taken into consideration. Figure 10 illustrates how bikeways can evolve over time – from a buffered bike lane to a separated bike lane with permanent, hardened infrastructure.

Figure 9: Project Recommendation Development Process




Figure 10: Evolution of a Buffered Bike Lane




Table 5 shows a summary of the recommended bikeway network by bikeway type. Though 80 percent of the recommended network is comprised of low-stress all ages and abilities bikeways, there are several corridors where conventional bike lanes are being recommended.

To build separated bikeways in these corridors would, in most cases, require complete reconstruction and significant capital investment. While there may be better justification and opportunity to make this investment sometime in the future, more feasible strategies such as bike lanes and traffic calming in the nearer-term would better support the connectivity, safety, and equity goals of this Plan.

The recommended bicycle network includes several “further study needed” segments or corridors just as the 2014 plan did. These are corridors where there may be significant constraints, inter-agency coordination, or policy considerations for implementing a priority bikeway type. These segments will be studied to determine the best solution for accommodating people of all ages and abilities. A list of recommended bicycle network projects is included in Appendix D.

Ninety-five percent of low-income households are within a quarter mile of the recommended bikeway network.

Table 5: Summary of Recommended Bicycle Network by Bikeway Type

| Bikeway Type | Number of projects | Miles | Percentage of recommended bikeway network |
|--|--------------------|-------|---|
| Separated Bike Lane | 72 | 46.8 | 36% |
| Bike Boulevards | 79 | 34.9 | 27% |
| Multi-use Trail | 20 | 21.6 | 17% |
| Bike Lane | 35 | 18.6 | 14% |
| Other (shared lane markings, paved shoulder) | 10 | 3.2 | 2% |
| Further Study Needed | 20 | 4.6 | 4% |

Figure 11: Map of Recommended Bikeway Network (North Bellingham)





Figure 12: Map of Recommended Bikeway Network (Central Bellingham)




Recommended Bikeway

- Separated Bike Lane
- Shared Lane Markings
- Bike Lane
- Paved Shoulder
- Bike Boulevard
- Further Study Needed
- Multi-Use Trail
- ◆ Spot Improvement
- Urban Growth Area
- Urban Village
- Park
- Existing On-Street Bikeway
- Existing Trail
- Public School

TOOLE DESIGN

Figure 13: Map of Recommended Bikeway Network (South Bellingham)




Recommended Bikeway

- Separated Bike Lane
- Shared Lane Markings
- Bike Lane
- Paved Shoulder
- Bike Boulevard
- Further Study Needed
- Multi-Use Trail
- ◆ Spot Improvement
- Urban Growth Area
- Urban Village
- Park
- Existing On-Street Bikeway
- Existing Trail
- Public School

TOOLE DESIGN

Figure 14: Map of Recommended Bikeway Network (East Bellingham)



THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Recommended Bikeway

- Separated Bike Lane
- Bike Lane
- Bike Boulevard
- Multi-Use Trail
- Shared Lane Markings
- Paved Shoulder
- Further Study Needed
- ◆ Spot Improvement
- Urban Growth Area
- Urban Village
- Park
- Existing On-Street Bikeway
- Existing Trail
- Public School



7 Programmatic Actions

Programmatic actions are ongoing activities that further support the implementation of plan goals and strengthen the bicycling culture in Bellingham. The programmatic action recommendations reflect City resources, potential for partnership, and what is likely to “move the needle” in terms of encouraging and supporting a bicycling culture in Bellingham. Actions are not listed in order of priority, but rather the City will seek funding and partnership opportunities to implement programs in coordination with infrastructure improvements over time.

SAFE ROUTES TO SCHOOL (SRTS) PROGRAMS

Goal 1: Safety

Bellingham has implemented Safe Routes to School (SRTS) programs at a small number of schools funded by WSDOT SRTS grants. The program encourages students to bike and walk to school where they are not currently doing so, while making it safer for students who are already biking and walking. A key component of the program is educating students on safe bicycling (and walking) behavior. Safety messages need to be reinforced over time, especially as adolescents near driving age.

SRTS programs in Bellingham are currently managed by Smart Trips, Whatcom County's trip-logging app. Institutionalizing the SRTS program in all schools would complement current Everybody BIKE program offerings such as bicycle skills courses and bicycle safety assemblies for elementary students. Underserved neighborhoods should be prioritized when implementing SRTS programs. Close coordination with Bellingham School District will enhance the effectiveness of this program.

EXPAND AND DIVERSIFY THE BICYCLING COMMUNITY

Goal 2: Equity

The City should support and partner with organizations to deliver programs designed to encourage bicycling by women, people of color, people with disabilities, non-English speakers, low-income populations, seniors, and youth. Partnership may come in the form of micro-grants, providing material support for events, and/or dedicated staff time.

BIKE/SCOOTER SHARE

Goal 2: Equity

Goal 4: Increase Ridership

The City has done some work to assess the feasibility of an e-bike bikeshare and/or scooter share program. The next step will be to issue a Request for Proposals (RFP) from potential bike or scooter share vendors. Prior to doing this, the City should develop requirements and policies to ensure that the bike or scooter share systems are properly managed, address equity needs, and usage data is shared. The [North American Bikeshare & Scootershare Association \(NABSA\)](#) has resources the City can use to craft a RFP and policies, as do other cities in Washington that have successfully launched these programs.



E-BIKE REBATE PROGRAMS

Goal 2: Equity

Goal 4: Increase Ridership

Electric bicycles, or e-bikes, are becoming an increasingly popular option for bicycling. They provide a way for people to take longer trips by bike and can help make bicycling more accessible to community members who are interested in bicycling. E-bikes can provide a practical solution for replacing cars for commuting and running errands, especially in hilly terrain. E-bikes can encourage bicycling as both a recreational and utilitarian mode of transportation. With their increased popularity, state regulations and local policy are critical to supporting the use of the growing bicycle network in Bellingham, as well as public education and awareness.

The City should support and promote local, regional, and state rebate programs for e-bike ownership. Any rebate program should include a tiered system, with higher rebates for low-income individuals or individuals with disabilities. Rebate programs can increase use of e-bikes and broaden public awareness of using e-bikes as a sustainable, convenient, and affordable mode of transportation. The Washington State Legislature approved \$5 million for a statewide rebate program and an additional \$2 million for the creation of an e-bike lending program. These programs are anticipated to be implemented in 2024.

Additional resources for e-bike policies can be found at [PeopleForBikes.org](https://www.peopleforbikes.org/):

- [National Electric Bicycle Law and Policy Overview](#)
- [Electric Bicycles: Public Perceptions & Policy](#)

PROVIDE MORE BICYCLE PARKING

Goal 3: Connectivity

As the number of people cycling increases, bike parking should meet the increasing demand. Bicycle parking should be available any place there is vehicle parking, but especially near commercial businesses, social service providers, schools, and parks. Bicycle parking facilities, including racks, lockers, bike rooms, bike cages, and valets, should be strategically placed to provide safe and accessible places for short- and long-term bike parking. Secure long-term, covered bike lockers should be provided at transit facilities, Park and Rides, and the airport, as well as multi-family and commercial developments.

Parking should accommodate bicycles of different sizes, including longer wheelbase cargo and children's bikes, and power for charging e-bikes. Additionally, bicycle registration programs and developing signage and educational materials about securely locking bikes can aid in reducing theft.

Short-term parking is typically designed for people visiting businesses or at locations where the duration of their visit is less than five hours. Typical racks used for short-term parking include inverted U, post and ring, and bike corrals. Bike corrals have a growing popularity throughout the US. Bike corrals typically replace one on-street vehicle parking space with eight to twelve bicycle parking spaces while preserving sidewalk space.

Long-term bicycle parking is designed toward employees, residents, public transit users, and similar users who need to store their bike for more than four hours. These parking facilities need to have increased security and weather protection to provide assurance that their bike will not be stolen or damaged. Long-term parking facilities include bike lockers and sheltered and secured enclosures.

The Association of Pedestrian and Bicycle Professionals (APBP) has developed the [Essentials of Bike Parking: Selecting and Installing Bicycle Parking that Works \(2015\)](#) and the [Bicycle Parking Guidelines, 2nd Edition \(2010\)](#) that provide widely accepted recommendations and examples of bicycle parking best practices and example policies.

Ways to Provide Bike Parking

There are multiple ways to deliver more bicycle parking, including:

- Developing a regional or municipal-level program to respond to requests and proactively identify locations where additional bike parking can support ridership and local businesses.
- A bicycle parking sponsorship program
- Directing fees from new development to bicycle parking, and
- Exploring public private partnerships to implement bike parking

Developing a bicycle parking program at the municipal level would help to increase the amount of high-quality bicycle parking by improving coordination between public requests, property owners and businesses, City departments, and other agencies. The program would also be the point of contact to address questions or concerns and ensure bicycle racks are replaced by developers if they are removed during the construction process.



Credit: Sustrans

REDUCE DRIVING SPEEDS

Goal 1: Safety

Goal 4: Increase Ridership

Vehicle speed has a significant impact on the safety and comfort of the bicycling experience. Most of Bellingham's streets have a posted speed limit of 25 mph, however in many cases people drive much faster than this. The City will be updating its speed limit setting policy based on latest best practice. This will entail collecting speed data, analyzing the difference between the posted speed and prevailing driving speed, and looking at crash history. This analysis will inform adjustments to the posted speed as well as where street design modifications are needed to achieve the target or posted speed. The City will also explore a citywide reduction of residential street speed limits from 25 mph to 20 mph, something other cities like Tacoma and Seattle have done in recent years.

Traffic conditions on residential streets can have an impact on the livability and sense of community in City neighborhoods. It is important to monitor and address safety issues on the residential streets that give the city so much of its character.

Prior to 2008 the City had a neighborhood traffic calming program, referred to as the Neighborhood Traffic Safety Program (NTSP), to reduce cut-through traffic and speeding on residential streets. The City is re-establishing this program to work with the community to address neighborhood related traffic safety concerns. The new program should ensure that residents can help shape and prioritize solutions for their communities through an inclusive and equitable process. The NTSP staff works with residents to find creative, data informed and community-driven solutions for local traffic issues to create safer and more connected community.

DEVELOP ENGINEERING STANDARDS

Goal 1: Safety

Goal 3: Connectivity

Consistent design of bicycle infrastructure is important for creating an intuitive bikeway network that is understood by those using it, as well as those interacting with it while walking or driving. To this end the City should develop engineering standard details to consistently design bike infrastructure. These details should be based on industry best practices, many of which are captured in the City of Bellingham [Bicycle and Pedestrian Toolbox](#), as well as national guidance from AASHTO and NACTO.



City of Bellingham Bicycle & Pedestrian Toolbox



January 2023



SYSTEMATICALLY IMPLEMENT A WAYFINDING SYSTEM

Goal 3: Connectivity

The City has created a wayfinding brand and placed signs in spot locations to direct bicyclists to primary destinations. The main purpose of a wayfinding system is to connect people to the places they want to go. More systematic placement of wayfinding signs can help bicyclists easily and successfully navigate through a network of on-street facilities and trails. As a next step for advancing wayfinding, the City should consider applying its wayfinding brand to a broader palette of signage and markings, including directional signage, mile markers, trail heads, informational signs, map kiosks, and pavement markings and develop a placement protocol and plan for systematic installation. The wayfinding plan might prioritize low-stress routes as a means to help people of all ages and abilities feel more comfortable navigating the network.


Wayfinding signage is a cost-effective way to improve conditions for people bicycling, walking, and rolling, create a sense of place, and promote community development. There may be an opportunity to partner with the Bellingham Chamber of Commerce and tourism industry to implement a wayfinding program that is unified and addresses the needs of all people navigating Bellingham's streets and trails.

ENGAGE THE COMMUNITY IN BIKEWAY MAINTENANCE

Goal 1: Safety

Goal 4: Increase Ridership

[Policy 1.7](#) calls for sufficient allocation of budgetary resources to maintain a growing network of bikeways. The section on maintenance in Chapter 5 discussed the many maintenance needs of a safe and comfortable bikeway network. Being able to quickly respond to maintenance, particularly seasonal maintenance needs such as leaf removal is challenging for any city. At the same time there are many community members and businesses that want to see well-maintained bikeways. The City should explore engaging volunteers in seasonal bikeway maintenance to augment (not replace) City maintenance resources. Such a program could be analogous to well established "Adopt-a-Street" programs. In the case of bikeway maintenance blocks near businesses, schools, parks, and other community destinations could be adopted by community groups or businesses. Seattle Street Fixers is one example of a community-based group that matches volunteers with maintenance needs that the City of Seattle has had difficulty addressing.



PARTNER WITH LOCAL BUSINESSES, COLLEGES, AND BICYCLE ORGANIZATIONS

Goal 4: Increase Ridership

Bellingham already has several programs and organizations focused on increasing bicycling and creating an inclusive bicycling culture, such as Whatcom Smart Trips, Walk and Roll Bellingham, The Adaptive and Inclusive Recreation Program of Whatcom County (AIROW), Mount Baker Bicycle Club, and other local organizations that the City can partner with on promotional efforts.

Whatcom [Smart Trips](#) should continue its efforts to reach the general public and employers. This should include information and local examples of employers who offer incentives to encourage employees to bike to work, and special awards/recognition for local employers with successful bike commute programs. Whatcom Smart Trips may also play a role informing businesses about the League of American Bicyclists' [Bicycle Friendly Business](#) (BFB) recognition program. Local bicycle clubs and colleges could coordinate efforts to promote student bicycling through events and campaigns.

Western Washington University (a silver status [Bicycle Friendly University](#)), Whatcom Community College, and Bellingham Technical College together have over 30,000 full and part-time students. This represents a tremendous opportunity for partnership between these institutions, the City, and other government agencies to promote bicycling and offer incentives and events.

CREATE STREETS FOR PEOPLE

Goal 4: Increase Ridership

There are opportunities to close streets either temporarily or permanently to cars, or prioritize people walking, biking, and rolling by reducing vehicle access through traffic restriction measures.

Open Streets programs temporarily close streets to vehicle traffic so that people may use them for walking, bicycling, dancing, playing, roller skating, and more. They provide a safe space for people to ride and to learn just how easy it can be to get around on two wheels. While leisurely riding, participants can discover buildings, neighborhoods, and places they've never noticed before. Open Streets events encourage physical activity and social interaction and boost local businesses. They can be one-time, weekly, or monthly events, and are generally very popular and well-attended. The City should partner with other community agencies to develop a pilot event, using information and resources provided by the [Open Streets Project initiative](#).

More permanent measures for re-orienting streets to people include strict closures (i.e., blocking entry of cars) or limiting vehicle access. Different cities have given these efforts different names such as "slow streets", "healthy streets", and "pavement to parks," but all are aimed at providing more space for people and enhancing neighborhood livability. The City of Seattle offers good examples where they have converted some neighborhood greenways (the equivalent of Bellingham's bicycle boulevards) to so called Healthy Streets, which legally allow people to walk in the street (even where sidewalks are present) and signal limited access to drivers using neckdowns and signage. Seattle also has a pavement to parks program that converts underutilized or redundant street space to space for people. Some opportunities for doing this in Bellingham include short segments of C, D, and E Streets where the western approach of these streets with Cornwall Street result in awkward intersection geometries. These short segments may be unnecessary from a traffic circulation perspective and closing them could improve safety and provide space for neighborhood activities and amenities.



PROVIDE EDUCATION FOR MOTORISTS

Goal 1: Safety

Promoting a safety culture and educating drivers on how to share the road with bicyclists will help make biking in Bellingham feel safer. The City should develop an informational campaign aimed at motorists that utilizes local driver training schools, public service announcements, and the City website. These platforms can disseminate information about the laws and practices related to sharing the roadways with all users including laws related to motor vehicle behavior around pedestrians and bicyclists, such as the three-foot law. Above all, messaging should evoke empathy for the vulnerability of people walking, rolling, and biking.

EXPAND BICYCLE EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES


Goal 1: Safety

Offering and effectively publicizing bicycle skills courses to community members of all ages can help encourage safe biking habits and increase the confidence of roadway users of all ages and abilities. Strategies for increasing participation in courses may include offering courses through employers and offering a variety of course formats (e.g., full-day, half-day, or weekly for several consecutive weeks). A clear, centralized information source such as a page on the City's website can help increase awareness of these events. Courses should be planned for a wide range of abilities and ages. The City should seek community partners to offer courses and could be a co-applicant or sponsor on grants to help fund these activities. The City or its partner(s) should also work with colleges in Bellingham to integrate bicycle safety courses into the orientation programs held at the beginning of each school year.

DISTRIBUTE INFORMATION ON PROPER USE OF BICYCLE FACILITIES

Goal 1: Safety

As Bellingham continues to improve its bicycle network, information should be provided to encourage the correct use of newer bikeway types and treatments. Information on bikeway facilities should be distributed in multiple mediums so it is accessible to as many road users as possible. This information should be posted on the City's website and at popular recreation and transportation centers (e.g., bus stations, signs at popular bike trails). Another distribution method the City should consider is the use of quick response (QR) codes that direct users to resources on the internet. Temporary signs should be used alongside new facilities to educate users about proper use.





8 Implementation

The recommended network of bikeways, enhanced crossings and intersections, and multi-use trail connections will allow people to safely and comfortably connect to where they work, go to school, shop, and recreate. Turning the ideas generated by public feedback and the analysis of needs into useful projects on the ground is a complex task. It requires prioritizing projects, identifying funding sources, and collaborating with other agencies, City departments, and the private development community to realize best value projects that are the most feasible given the City's resource limitations. This chapter includes an overview of the City's implementation strategy, including how projects are prioritized, mechanisms used for implementation, and performance measures for tracking implementation progress.

An implementation plan that includes a fiscally-constrained prioritized project list has been developed separate from the Plan as project implementation is a dynamic process that can change from year-to-year based on the City's fiscal outlook and opportunities that arise from grant funding, utility and other City project coordination, and private development. The implementation plan will be revisited and updated on an annual basis.

HOW PROJECTS ARE SCORED AND RANKED

Project prioritization is a multifactor effort that attempts to identify the highest value projects in terms of the Plan’s goals balanced with the City’s fiscal constraints. Bicycle project recommendations were scored based on four factors that should inform implementation, including;

Goal-based prioritization centered on criteria tied to the Plan goals of safety, equity, accessibility, connectivity and trip potential. Examples of criteria used include proximity to schools and transit, level of traffic stress, proximity to low-income housing, and population/employment. Appendix B presents the methodology used for goal-based prioritization. Figures 14-17 show the prioritized bicycle projects based on the goal-based criteria.

Scores generated by the goal-based prioritization methodology were then combined with the following three factors that relate to project design, permitting, construction, and funding. These three factors take into account the realities of completing a project on any single segment of the prioritized bikeway network based on the characteristics of that segment and the planning level scope of the project.

Project scale and complexity, which takes into account the relative size of the project in terms of length, impact to development, or environmental factors which can increase design and permitting timelines, regardless of funding source. Scores for complexity were given on a 3-point scale, with the highest value assigned to the least complex project, elevating projects that are easier to implement. Scores were normalized to a maximum of one point in the final scoring.

Project cost, which accounts for the reality of the City’s fiscal resource limitations. A score based on the percentile rank of the project cost relative to the most expensive project was calculated, with a maximum of one point available. Less expensive projects were ranked higher than more expensive projects.

Project grant competitiveness, which identifies projects that are likely to rank well in highly competitive state

and federal grant funding programs. Competitiveness was ranked on a 4-point scale, with 4 being the most competitive. The scores were normalized with a maximum of one point scored for highly competitive projects.

The four scores together help to prioritize a lengthy list of projects that was identified throughout the Plan process. The scoring identifies projects that have the potential to realize the most value in terms of the Plan goals, as determined by the goal-based prioritization, and that are the most feasible for the City to implement, given the resource constraints that are captured by the other three scoring factors.

Prioritization of projects assumes that all projects are being constructed independently by the City as bicycle projects. This assumption is likely conservative and there will be opportunities to construct projects as part of larger roadway projects, such as the James Street or Bakerview improvement projects, projects that also serve pedestrians (as identified in the Pedestrian Master Plan), as part of utility maintenance activities that impact roadways, or as part of development or redevelopment projects. If projects are able to be incorporated into development or redevelopment, some of the cost burden may be shared by private development partners. Additionally, grouping of projects into packages, as described in the “Funding Strategies” section of this chapter, could realize efficiencies of mobilization, permitting, stormwater management, utilities impacts, and cost of materials and labor.

Figure 15: Goal-Based Bikeway Prioritization (North Bellingham)





Figure 16: Goal-Based Bikeway Project Prioritization (East Bellingham)




Priority Level

- | Bike Facility | Spot Improvement |
|---------------|------------------|
| High | High |
| Medium-High | Medium-High |
| Medium-Low | Medium-Low |
| Low | Low |

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Urban Growth Area | Existing On-Street Bikeway |
| Urban Village | Existing Trail |
| Park | Proposed Trail |
| Public School | |

TOOLE
DESIGN

Figure 17: Goal-Based Bikeway Project Prioritization (Central Bellingham)




Priority Level

- | Bike Facility | Spot Improvement |
|---------------|------------------|
| High | High |
| Medium-High | Medium-High |
| Medium-Low | Medium-Low |
| Low | Low |

- | | |
|-------------------|----------------------------|
| Urban Growth Area | Existing On-Street Bikeway |
| Urban Village | Existing Trail |
| Park | Proposed Trail |
| Public School | |

TOOLE
DESIGN

Figure 18: Goal-Based Bikeway Project Prioritization (South Bellingham)



IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

While bicycle projects were evaluated as individual projects, their implementation will be most resource efficient when combined into packages that leverage opportunities presented by other roadway, utility, and development projects.

Generally bicycle projects fall into one of three categories: catalyst, complementary, and opportunity projects. The categories are a framework guiding implementation by the City through a year-by-year program which will be both deliberate and opportunistic.

Catalyst projects are single large-scale project of low to moderate complexity, that are good grant funding candidates and can anchor a package of multiple geographically connected individual improvements. Catalyst projects are intended to be deliberate efforts that can be planned for through budgetary commitments and pursuit of grant funds. Table 6 provides details on the BMP Catalyst Projects.

Complementary projects are of a moderate scale or a higher complexity and are less likely to be good grant candidates on their own. Individual complementary projects could be packaged into a single project of multiple geographically connected improvements. These projects are likely to be almost fully locally funded, although packages of complementary projects may be good grant candidates on a systemic level. Projects with complexity concerns, such as significant need for new right of way, topographical challenges, or environmental impacts that may require extended permitting, may fall in this category.

Opportunity projects are of a small scale, low complexity, and are good candidates for being either combined with Catalyst or complementary projects, or with other City projects such as utility maintenance. Opportunity projects may also be completed in cooperation with private development. Opportunity projects are unlikely to be grant funding candidates on their own, but packages of opportunity projects may be good candidates on a systemic level. Opportunity projects are less likely to be directly programmed for construction unless they are part of Catalyst projects, maintenance activities or roadway projects.



Table 6: Catalyst Bicycle Project List

| Project 01 Name | | Downtown Bellingham Bike Comfort Improvements |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Project ID | Linear #14 | |
| Project limits | Many corridors between Broadway and Ellis in the downtown area, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Holly Street • State Street • Cornwall Avenue • Commercial Street • H Street • Bay Street | |
| Project scope | Removal of on-street parking, turn lanes, converting to parallel parking, narrowing lanes, and removing center turn lanes to implement separated and standard bike lanes throughout downtown. Moving existing bike lanes adjacent to parallel parking to the curb and relocating parking to be a buffer to traffic lanes. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Add "bridging" shared lane markings. Reconfiguration of the Holly/Ellis intersection to match the bike-enhanced style of the Chestnut/Ellis intersection. | |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$1,825,000 | |
| Project 02 Name | | Happy Valley Bike Network Improvements |
| Project ID | Linear #30 | |
| Project limits | Old Fairhaven Pwky from 21st to 32nd 21st from Bill McDonald to Donovan 32nd from Fielding to Old Fairhaven Pkwy Harris Ave from 14th to 24th And connecting streets in the vicinity | |
| Project scope | Widening of Old Fairhaven Pkwy and Harris Avenue to install separated bike lanes. Removing parking and narrowing lanes to install bike lanes. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Installation of an RRFB and bike treatments at 24th and Old Fairhaven Pkwy. | |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$3,350,000 | |

| Project 03 Name | | James Street Corridor Improvements |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Project ID | Linear #50 | |
| Project limits | James Street from Sunset to Meador Carolina from Cornwall to Lincoln (Boulevard project) Kentucky from Cornwall to Nevada (Boulevard project) Iron, Maryland and King Streets (Boulevard project) | |
| Project scope | Remove parking in favor of separated bike lanes. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Installation of an RRFB and bike treatments at James/Kentucky and James/North (overlap with Ped projects). Conduct alternatives study for improvements on James Street (Iowa to Meador, Sunset to Illinois). | |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$1,025,000 | |
| Project 04 Name | | Cornwall Avenue Bike Comfort Improvements |
| Project ID | Linear #44 | |
| Project limits | Cornwall Avenue from Champion to Parkview Elementary G, F and H Streets from roughly Holly to Cornwall | |
| Project scope | Remove parking and two way left turn lanes in favor of separated bike lanes. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Installation of RRFBs and bike treatments, where feasible, at Cornwall/North. Add no turn on red signs at Cornwall/Ohio. | |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$1,275,000 | |
| Project 05 Name | | Lakeway Drive Multiuse Trail and Network Extension |
| Project ID | Linear #7 | |
| Project limits | Lakeway Drive from Puget to Undine Toldeo, Puget, Whatcom, Woburn, Lopez, Racine, Consolidation, San Juan, Newton, Spieden, in the area of the main project (Bike Boulevards) | |
| Project scope | Construct south side multiuse trail on Lakeway. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Add no turn on red signs at Lakeway/Puget. | |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$3,600,000 | |
| Project 06 Name | | Woburn Street Separated Bike Lanes and Network Extension |
| Project ID | Linear #66 | |
| Project limits | Woburn Street from Texas to Sunset Texas, Illinois, Saint Clair, Superior, Maryland, Yew Streets in project area (Bike Boulevards) | |
| Project scope | Narrow existing lanes, roadway widening and removing parking to accommodate separated bike lanes. Installation of an RRFB and bike treatments, where feasible, at Woburn/Texas (overlap with Ped projects). | |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$2,750,000 | |

| Project 07 Name | Meridian Street Multiuse Trail |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Project ID | Linear #131 |
| Project limits | Meridian Street from McCleod Road to Birchwood Kulshan Street, Oregon Street (Bike Boulevards) |
| Project scope | Construct multiuse trail on the west side of Meridian. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Add bike lane extensions at Birchwood/Northwest Conduct alternatives studies for improvements in adjacent segment of Meridian Street (Telegraph to McCleod) and at the Northwest roundabouts at I-5. |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$2,100,000 |
| Project 08 Name | Meador Avenue Multimodal Improvements |
| Project ID | Linear #106 |
| Project limits | Meador Avenue from James Street to Fraser Street James, York, Potter Streets (Bike Boulevards) |
| Project scope | Construct multiuse trail on the north/east side of Meador Avenue. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Construct mini roundabouts within right of way at James and Meador and Fraser and Meador. |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$3,500,000 |
| Project 09 Name | Lakeway Drive Multiuse Trail Extension (Phase I) |
| Project ID | Linear #5 |
| Project limits | Lakeway Drive from Silver Beach Rd to Electric Avenue (trail) Silver Beach, York, Lowell, Xenia, Alvarado, Edwards, Roland, Whatcom, Birch (Bike Boulevards) |
| Project scope | Pave and widen existing trail on the north side of Lakeway, extend to project limits by removing parking. Remove parking to add separated bike lanes. Add markings and signs to delineate bike boulevards. Installation of bike boxes and bike lane extensions at Electric/Portal and Lakeway/Birch. |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$3,100,000 |
| Project 10 Name | Lakeway Drive Multiuse Trail Improvements (Phase II) |
| Project ID | Linear #6 |
| Project limits | Lakeway from Yew to Silver Beach |
| Project scope | Pave and widen existing north side multiuse trail. Reconstruct signal at Lakeway and Yew to accommodate bikes, future improvements on Yew and Lakeway west of Yew. |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$3,250,000 |

| Project 11 Name | Fairhaven Bike Corridor Studies |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Project ID | Linear #225 |
| Project limits | 12th Street from Mill Ave to Old Fairhaven Pkwy Donovan Ave from 21st to 32nd Harris Ave from 10th to 14th Connelly Ave from 32nd to 36th |
| Project scope | Conduct further study of the listed corridors for feasibility of bike treatments. Corridors include on-street parking, heavy retail activity, or would require widening. Scope of appropriate bike treatments would be determined by the study for future programming and grant funds identification. |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$500,000 |
| Project 12 Name | Douglas Ave Multimodal Improvements |
| Project ID | Linear #228 (modified) |
| Project limits | Douglas Avenue from 21st to 32nd |
| Project scope | Construct a multiuse path along Douglas Avenue, and extending south along 27th Street |
| Planning level cost estimate (\$2024) | \$3,125,000 |

Strategy A: Develop fundable project packages

The City has had success with packaging of projects in the past decade of bicycle project implementation and should maintain this practice. Developing packages of linear and spot improvement projects around one or two catalyst projects, with inclusion of geographically adjacent and/or connected complementary projects and opportunity projects will allow the City to implement projects with reduced costs, reduced internal management and a more deliberate process that increases ranking in grant funding competitions. Careful packaging of projects to be large enough to be meaningful, but small enough to fit within City budgetary or grant program funding limits is important to maintaining the feasibility of implementing project packages.

Actions:

- Organize project packages centered around catalyst projects based on known City projects, development, utility improvements, or legislative priorities.
- Limit project package construction costs to feasible and fundable amounts based on the intention to fund locally or via an identified grant program, in consideration of the grant program's typical funding limitations.
- Pursue capital improvements funding or grant funding for higher-priority bicycle projects and project packages.
- Identify a 5-year grant plan around expected grant opportunities and engage with grant program managers to present the planned nature of the City's applications.
- Update the Plan project list every five years to identify new facility improvements and programmatic opportunities as the bicycle network develops, assess their feasibility, gauge public support, identify funding sources, and develop implementation strategies.

Strategy B: Identify opportunity projects

Inclusion of bicycle improvements in other roadway, utility, and/or maintenance projects is an important method of implementing the prioritized project list. Bundling bicycle improvements into other such projects can potentially lower costs and exceed anticipated schedules, due to economies of scale, when compared to an approach where projects were to be individually funded, designed, and completed. Improvements classified as opportunity projects are good candidates for this type of implementation strategy, but even complementary or catalyst projects could have overlap with other City work and should be pursued regardless of priority ranking if an opportunity exists.

Actions:

- Work with the City's internal Asset Replacement Committee (ARC) and other Public Works and Parks project managers to identify opportunities for inclusion of bicycle projects in other project types.
- Where grant requirements or construction in conjunction with another roadway project make construction of a lower priority project possible or required by law, pursue funding sources for that project regardless of priority.

Strategy C: Align Planning Efforts

There are several planning documents that complement the Plan, including the Local Road Safety Plan and Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PRO) Plan, and Pedestrian Master Plan that should be maintained and updated to ensure consistency with the Plan and demonstrate alignment of City plans and policies. Each of these plans contribute to the bicycle network and help to ensure the City has a wide range of grant funds available to assist in completion of bicycle projects.

Actions:

- Review and update the City's Local Road Safety Plan every two years.
- Continue to coordinate and align projects and policies identified in the PRO Plan.
- Review City standards to ensure alignment with current best practices for bicycle facilities and to assist in the implementation of the prioritized project list.

Strategy D: Explore partnerships

The City should continue to explore partnerships that have been previously successful in leveraging local funding. This can be accomplished by receiving funding from other agencies, providing support to other agencies, or other methods. This approach demonstrates to grant funding agencies the viability and importance of a project. The Bellingham School District, Western Washington University, and Whatcom Transportation Authority, among others, should be engaged to identify further partnership opportunities.

Actions:


- Approach partnership agencies with a list of high priority projects directly affecting their constituency.
- Gather formal support letters and financial support where feasible ahead of grant funding applications for projects serving partner agencies, such as Safe Routes to School.
- Identify non-traditional grant funding opportunities for schools, transit, etc. that could have a bicycle infrastructure component and provide City support letters, funding, etc. to those grant applications.
- Encourage inclusion of Plan projects in capital improvements by other partner agencies.
- Maintain and develop new strategic partnerships with community agencies and businesses to promote programs that build support for biking and provide economic development potential.

Strategy E: Focus on equity

Strategy E considers the prioritized project list as a starting point for implementing projects. Although equity-focused criteria were used to prioritize bicycle projects, additional steps can be taken to ensure a strong equity emphasis for which projects are implemented first. Those prioritized projects that do not fall within areas of the City that have historically been underinvested may be delayed in favor of high priority projects that fall within areas of underinvestment or with socioeconomic or other equity needs.

Actions:

- Provide proactive opportunities for continued public input on project implementation, especially among groups who have had limited input in the Plan.
- Review available City data on historical investment and socio-economic needs.
- Identify transit-dependent communities and prioritize projects, especially those with a transit link, in those areas of the City.



FUNDING SOURCES

This Plan identifies a robust and comprehensive bicycle network. Development of the complete network is the long-term goal for the City. However, even with dedicated funding sources such as the Transportation Fund (T-Fund)⁷, it is not possible to complete all the projects identified through this planning process in the 10-year timeframe of the Plan. The City estimates that sales tax revenue generated through the T-Fund may provide about \$4 million annually for pedestrian- and bicycle-focused capital improvements. Due to the need to balance T-Fund funding between pedestrian and bicycle projects, and based on historical Public Works data on the allocation of T-Fund funding, an assumption has been made that 75% of the T-Fund revenue could be used for prioritized pedestrian and bicycle projects. The actual percentage of T-Fund funding allocated to bicycle improvements will need to be decided each year by the City Council serving in their capacity as the T-Fund Board of Directors and can be changed year-to-year.

Acquiring non-local funding for projects and programs is a key factor in meeting the goal of more rapid implementation of the Plan project list. The estimated cost to implement all the projects recommended in the Plan is \$520,000,000. The City's annual funding

dedicated to pedestrian and bicycle projects over a 10-year period is approximately \$43,500,000, resulting in a shortfall of about \$476,500,000. Therefore, without identifying significant additional revenue sources, the City must seek other funding partnerships and opportunities to implement the project list. Identification through the project prioritization and categorization process of likely grant candidate catalyst projects and project packages is the first step towards bringing in non-local state and federal funding to help build out the bicycle network.

Bicycle projects and programs are funded through multiple sources, and not all sources apply to all projects. Many non-local grant funding sources require a local funding match (i.e., a percent of total funding that the City must provide), and most are competitive based on project merit, adherence to grant criteria, and state or federal facility standards and procedures. The City has been very successful in leveraging local funding to secure state and federal grants for multi-modal transportation improvements. Table 7 provides examples that illustrate the mix of funding sources used by past City of Bellingham infrastructure projects.

A full list of funding sources available to the City to plan and construct bicycle facilities, or to provide awareness, encouragement, or education programs is provided in Appendix C. The funding sources represent a snapshot in time (i.e., as of 2024) and may change over the course of the anticipated 10-year implementation period for the master plan projects.

Table 7: Project Funding Examples

| Cost Estimate by Funding Source (in thousands of 2022 Dollars) | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|----------------|---------------------------|
| Project Name | Street Fund | T-Fund | Private Mitigation | WTA / Bellingham Schools | STBG ⁸ / SRTS ⁹ (Federal) | WSDOT Ped-Bike | TIB ¹⁰ (State) |
| Telegraph Road Multimodal Safety Improvements | \$1,850 | \$3,250 | \$250 | \$107 | \$1,650 | N/A | \$100 |
| W. Illinois St Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Improvements | N/A | \$800 | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$1,357 | \$550 |
| E Maple/ Lincoln St Intersection Safety Improvements | \$70 | N/A | \$100 | N/A | N/A | N/A | \$480 |
| Parkview ES Safe Routes to School | N/A | \$250 | N/A | \$150 | \$1,620 | N/A | \$350 |

⁷ The Transportation Fund is derived from a 2/10 of 1% (0.2%) sales tax, which was approved by Bellingham voters in 2020 for a 10-year period and will remain until December 31, 2030.

⁸ [Surface Transportation Block Grant Program](#).

⁹ [Safe Routes to School](#)

¹⁰ [Transportation Improvement Board](#), Complete Streets Award



PERFORMANCE MEASURES

Performance measures help to assess progress in meeting goals around safety, equity, connectivity, and accessibility. Performance measures are also a way to objectively document and celebrate the impact the City’s investment in bicycle infrastructure has over time, helping the City’s policy makers continue to support and expand financial resources for project implementation.

The performance measures for the bicycle network are based on the following principles:

- The measure is policy-driven and can be supported by data.
- Data can be collected with available resources.
- Data are consistently available over time.
- Data allow year-to-year comparisons.
- The results are understandable to the general public.

Proposed performance measures build on Bellingham’s Transportation Report on Annual Mobility (TRAM) and are intended to demonstrate that investments in the bicycle network are effective and well managed.

Specific performance measures based on the Plan goals and the criteria used to prioritize projects are included in Table 8.

The City should continue to report a summary of performance measures in a consistent, user-friendly and easy to read format, provided to City Council in a public forum, and posted on the City website. The report of performance measures should be updated annually with comparisons to at least the last three years’ data as a benchmark to demonstrate changes in data and improvements to the system.

Table 8: Bicycle Master Plan Performance Measures

| Performance Measure | Performance Goal | Metric | Data Source |
|--|--|--|--|
| Goal 1: Safety | | | |
| Bicyclist/ micromobility crashes | Reduce rate of all crashes involving bicyclists or micromobility users | Compare year-over-year number of crashes as a rate per 1,000 population ¹¹ | Bellingham Police WSDOT |
| Serious injury or fatal bicyclist/ micromobility crashes | Eliminate all crashes involving bicyclists micromobility users resulting in serious injury or fatality | Compare year-over-year total number of injury and fatal crashes | Bellingham Police WSDOT |
| Level of traffic stress | Expand all ages and abilities (LTS 1 and 2) network | Percentage of network that is separated bikes lanes, bike boulevards, multi-use trails | Bellingham Public Works, Parks |
| Goal 2: Equity | | | |
| Areas of historical underinvestment or greatest need | Increase investment in areas of historical underinvestment in the City | Percent of all projects completed and percent of dollars invested in identified areas of the City | Bellingham Public Works, Planning |
| Access to low-income housing | Increase access to low-income housing | Number of projects within ¼ mile low-income housing | Bellingham Public Works, Planning |
| Goal 3: Connectivity | | | |
| Complete, connected network | Network completeness | Percentage of network complete | Bellingham Public Works |
| Park and trail access | Increase number of parks and trails directly connected to bike network | Number of parks and formal access points directly served by bikeway network | Bellingham Public Works, Parks |
| School bike routes | All schools accessible by all ages and abilities bikeways | Number of schools with all ages and abilities bikeways providing direct access from north, south, east, west | School district, Public Works |
| Goal 4: Increase Ridership | | | |
| Citywide biking rate | Increase number of people biking for all trip purposes | Compare year-over-year number of actual or estimated bicyclists at designated locations throughout the city. | Public Works (Use bicycle counters or subscribe to mobile phone data vendor) |
| Rate of kids walking to school | Yearly increases in rates of kids choosing to bike to school | Documented increase in bike rates during annual classroom surveys in elementary schools ¹² | Bellingham School District |

¹¹ If crashes are already low, a single crash can skew year-over-year results.

¹² Maintaining annual cycling surveys assists the City with a requirement for applications to WSDOT’s Safe Routes to School grant funding program



Appendices

Appendix A: Engagement Summary

Appendix B: Network Prioritization Framework

Appendix C: Funding Sources for Bicycle Projects and Programs

Appendix D: Project Lists

Appendix A: Engagement Summary



BICYCLE PLAN UPDATES COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Bellingham Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plan Updates
April 2024

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Executive Summary | 2 |
| Project Background | 2 |
| Community Engagement Plan | 2 |
| Equity Considerations | 5 |
| 2. Overall Findings | 6 |
| Our Reach | 7 |
| Survey Results | 7 |
| Webmap | 12 |
| Survey and Webmap Demographics | 14 |
| Public Comments | 16 |
| 3. Plan Development and Feedback | 18 |
| Plan Development | 18 |
| Feedback on Draft Plan | 19 |

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The City of Bellingham is updating the city-wide 2012 Pedestrian Master Plan and 2014 Bicycle Master Plan which identify strategies for improving walking and biking environments. The plan updates build upon the efforts the 2012 and 2014 plans and resulting projects in the past decade to advance safe, connected walking and biking networks and supportive programs that encourage active transportation in Bellingham. The plan updates investigate how the active transportation environment is working for the Bellingham community and suggest recommendations for infrastructure improvements and policies that will improve the community’s experience of active transportation.

The City of Bellingham has successfully implemented over half (52%) of the projects listed in the 2014 Bicycle Master Plan, and this update will focus on enhancing the plan in order to better reflect the present and future of Bellingham and the City’s available resources and needs. The Bicycle Master Plan Update focuses on addressing some of challenges that have come to light after 7 years of staff efforts to implement the 2014 plan. This includes exploring the feasibility of adding protected bikeways on Bellingham’s arterial streets and of revisiting the 21 “Further Study Needed” links in the Bellingham’s current Primary Bicycle Network.

Community engagement has been an integral part of the plan update to build awareness of existing projects and networks. Hearing from the community about their needs and vision for the city can inform projects, programs, and priorities for further building out the pedestrian and bicycle networks for people of all ages and abilities to safely and conveniently walk, bike, and roll in Bellingham.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN

The 2014 Bellingham Bicycle Master Plan incorporated community engagement in all phases of plan development. Outreach strategies included two open houses, an online survey and interactive map, and seven focus groups. In addition, there was an 8-member Steering Committee representing constituents from the following sectors: public health, major employers, schools, bicycle advocacy, homeless advocacy, and the City Transportation Commission. The committee met six times during the planning process to provide input and direction on all aspects of the plan. The outcomes and learnings from these community engagement strategies are reflected in the 2014 plan’s vision, goals, and recommendations.

The 2023 plan update aims to build upon this community outreach, extending efforts to reach to people who may not have been included in earlier planning processes and to be flexible and nimble as the community and conditions change. The engagement methods included in the plan update are listed below, in addition to the amendments made as we adapted along the way.

Engagement Plan Methods

Plan promotion has been continuously taking place since the launch of the project, and information has been shared with the public throughout the plan process. Commenting periods take place during the discovery phases of each plan (see Figure 1). This memo focuses on the methods used and findings gleaned from the discovery phase for the bicycle plan, during spring and early summer of 2023.

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY




Figure 1: Engagement timeline for the public highlighting commenting periods for each plan

The community engagement plan aimed to be both open –to give the opportunity for the entire Bellingham community to share their thoughts – and targeted – to ensure that we engaged with community members whose work and everyday life is shaped by bicycle infrastructure, who have traditionally not had the chance to participate in previous planning efforts. Both in-person and virtual engagement methods were included to meet people where they were while maintaining a channel where they could share their thoughts at any time.

Open Engagement

Open engagement included an interactive web map, an online survey, a pop-up event, and promotion at several events across Bellingham:

- The **Engage Bellingham** platform was used throughout the engagement process as the “home base” where the community could keep up to date with the stages of the project and learn about ways to get involved. The platform also had a space for public comments. The Engage Bellingham platform also hosted key promotional messaging including an informative fact sheet and a video in English and Spanish that outlines the plan updates and how to get involved. The web map and survey were accessible via EngageBellingham.org.
- An **interactive web map** was created by the City of Bellingham, and the link was shared on Engage Bellingham to create a space for Bellingham residents to note the locations where they were facing issues or barriers to accessing key destinations while cycling and where they would like to see improvements. The web map also allowed people to see comments that other people had made and to explore the existing conditions. The webmap was open from April 4 to May 31, 2023.
- An online **survey** was also conducted. Participants were offered a set of optional demographic questions as well as a suite of questions about their cycling experience in Bellingham and what they thought could be improved. The survey was also available in hard-copy form for use by community members who did not have access to or preferred not to use a computer or other device to complete the survey. The survey was included alongside the webmap, and responses were collected from April 4 to May 31, 2023.
- A **pop-up event** at the Bellingham Bike Parade on May 7, 2023, was put on by the City of Bellingham and Toole Design to raise awareness about the Bicycle Master Plan Update. Posterboards showing general information and goals of the plan update were displayed in both English and Spanish. There were

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

printed maps for visitors to add comments to, corresponding with the online webmap. In addition, cards with a QR code to the Engage Bellingham website were distributed. The event also included a children’s activity to make bicycle and helmet decorations.



[Figure 2 - photos from May 7th Bike Parade pop up event]

Targeted Engagement

Targeted engagement made use of the rich landscape of existing community groups that are operating in Bellingham. Targeted engagement had two aims: first, to engage communities that had not previously had the opportunity to add their voice to previous planning efforts in the city and that may be marginalized due to language, locational, or accessibility barriers, and second, to draw upon the specialized knowledge that certain interest groups have based on their everyday experiences with navigating Bellingham.

- The project team held **Technical Review Committee** (TRC) meetings, which were meetings with local groups whose work and daily life intersect with cycling in Bellingham. The TRC groups participating are listed below. During the TRC meetings, the project team provided a brief presentation on how and when the City is proposing to update the Bicycle Master Plan. General discussion took place based on a set of prepared questions. TRC members were also asked to make use of Engage Bellingham and the interactive map and survey as they refined their inputs.
 - April 10, 2023: The Adaptive and Inclusive Recreation Project of Whatcom County (AIROW)
 - April 17, 2023: Mount Baker Bicycle Club (MBBC)
 - April 20, 2023: Walk and Roll Bellingham
 - June 28, 2023: Bellingham Chamber of Commerce

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS

Equity and inclusivity were embedded in every step of the community engagement process.

- **Community Survey:** The survey was posted online and promoted by media outreach. Paper copies of the survey were available for people who are not able to access the internet.
- **Engage Bellingham Project Page:** The Engage Bellingham project website is available to access and interact with 24/7, which allows visitors to engage on their own schedules. It also allows individuals who may not be able to or don't feel comfortable to attend in-person events to engage. There are translation and interpretation services for those seeking information in languages other than English. The project page includes a timeline for the project, which provides transparent community engagement opportunities. All formatting is accessible for screen readers and images have alternative text.
- **Webmap:** The webmap was available 24/7 and had a section for those whose primary language is Spanish. Alternative text was provided for images, infographics, and tables on the website.
- **Storymap:** The Storymap will be written in a 5th grade reading level for easy understanding. The website will be available 24/7 with a section for those whose primary language is Spanish. Alternative text will be provided for images, infographics, maps and tables.
- **Technical Review Committee (TRC):** Technical review committees will represent the needs and interests of their most vulnerable stakeholders in the meetings. A summary of each technical review committee meeting will be posted for public viewing and commenting online. Topic-oriented technical review committees will cover a range of historically underserved and/or underrepresented community members, including people experiencing homelessness, people with disabilities, and people with low income).
- **Pop-up event:** materials were provided in both English and Spanish. There was a children's bicycle decoration-making activity to engage with people of different ages.
- **News release:** The news release informing the general public of the PMP and BMP updates and community engagement process included information in both English and Spanish on how community members can receive assistance with providing input and feedback.

2. OVERALL FINDINGS

People are generally enthusiastic about Bellingham's efforts to improve bicycle infrastructure.

Most survey respondents use bicycle infrastructure for commuting to and from work, day-to-day travel, leisure, and more. Comments applauded the City's commitment to investing in bicycle infrastructure, and many also indicated specific ways it can be improved, such as adding and maintaining bike lanes, network connectivity, and safety education of cyclists, motorists, and pedestrians.

There is a heightened interest in the addition of dedicated and protected bike lanes.

Results from the survey, webmap, and pop-up event all demonstrate the community's expressed desire for the addition of dedicated and protect bike lanes throughout the city of Bellingham. Biking is a popular mode of transportation in Bellingham, and a connected network of higher comfort bike lanes would encourage more people to ride a bike. Areas identified as needing bike lanes include Lakeway Drive and its continuation into East Holly Street and West Holly Street, Yew Street Road (outside of UGA), 32nd Street, 36th Street, James Street, and Meridian Street.

There is concern for safety at intersections and desire for improved ways of crossing.

The need for greater personal safety was a common theme shared during the community engagement phase. Safer street design, dedicated bicycle crossings, grade-separated crossings, improved signage, traffic calming, increased visibility, and the addition and enforcement of "no turn on red" signals are mentioned as potential improvements for safer crossings.

Cyclists would like to see more regulations for motorists, including traffic calming, signage, and speed limit reduction and enforcement.

Respondents expressed feeling unsafe while biking due to motorists exceeding the speed limit, not looking for bikes when turning, and merging conflicts. There were several requests to lower speed limits on certain streets, including Old Woburn St, Electric Ave, Iowa St, and James St. Another solution recommended by respondents is to add "no parking," "no turn on red," "share the road," or "yield to bicyclists" signage.

Missing links in the current bicycle network make it difficult for cyclists to safely and efficiently reach their destinations.

Over 100 webmap and survey comments identified missing links in the bicycle network, including bike lanes ending abruptly, incomplete trails, and barriers to crossing busy streets. Several comments mention I-5 acting as a barrier to easily getting to their destination and suggest adding an underpass or overpass for cyclists and pedestrians to get across.

There is a need for safe and secure bike parking.

Respondents expressed a need for safe and secure bike parking, especially around the city center. There are requests for bike parking at retail centers, sports fields, trailheads, medical centers, recreational facilities, and according to one comment, "anywhere there is car parking."

There is some resistance against investing in bicycle infrastructure.

Some respondents (45 survey comments and 5 webmap comments) indicated that there is no need for bicycle infrastructure projects in Bellingham. Reasons that were listed include the adequacy of existing infrastructure, regional geography and weather not being suitable for bikes, bike lanes slowing car traffic, bike lanes not being used enough, and misuse of tax dollars.

OUR REACH

Survey Participants: 582

Webmap Comments: 1,072

Total Webmap/Survey Interactions: 1,440

Pop-up Event Attendees: 12 direct participants, 40+ people to which project cards were handed out

Number of TRC Meetings: 4

Number of TRC Meeting Attendees: 10

Emails and Comments to the City: 212

SURVEY RESULTS

There was a total of 582 survey respondents. Survey questions covered topics including cycling habits, motivations and barriers to cycling, and attitudes on bicycle and motorist infrastructure. The figures below present the survey results.

Figure 3: In an average week, which of the following forms of transportation do you use to travel in Bellingham? Check all that apply.




Figure 4: The main reason I ride a bicycle is for _____. Please select all that apply.




Figure 5: Which of the following would improve your experience and/or lead you to choose to ride a bike more in Bellingham? Please select your top three.




Figure 6: Which of the following streets would you feel comfortable biking on?




Figure 7: Which of the following streets would you feel comfortable biking on with children?




Figure 8: What are some other ways bicycling can be supported in Bellingham? Please rank in order of importance.




Figure 9: How much do you agree with the following statements?


| | Being able to travel as quickly as possible to destinations should be the highest priority. | People should be able to get around in a car more easily than on a bicycle or on foot. | It's not okay to remove vehicle travel lanes for whatever reason. | It's not okay to remove on-street vehicle parking spaces for whatever reason |
|-------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Strongly agree | 54 | 62 | 76 | 67 |
| Somewhat agree | 111 | 53 | 38 | 47 |
| Neutral | 144 | 83 | 59 | 59 |
| Somewhat disagree | 139 | 119 | 100 | 118 |
| Strongly disagree | 123 | 252 | 293 | 276 |

| | Where there are two or more vehicle travel lanes in each direction it's okay to permanently remove a lane to improve other travel modes (e.g., bike lanes, sidewalks, transit lanes) when a feasibility study supports it. | It's okay to permanently remove on-street vehicle parking spaces to improve other travel modes (e.g., bike lanes, sidewalks, transit lanes) when a feasibility study supports it. | Safety for all road users, particularly more vulnerable users such as people walking and biking, should be the highest priority. | People should be able to get around Bellingham just as easily on a bicycle as in a car. |
|-------------------|--|---|--|---|
| Strongly agree | 305 | 270 | 389 | 400 |
| Somewhat agree | 118 | 134 | 102 | 71 |
| Neutral | 26 | 39 | 41 | 24 |
| Somewhat disagree | 32 | 40 | 12 | 27 |
| Strongly disagree | 90 | 87 | 23 | 48 |

WEBMAP

There were 1,072 webmap comments, and 1,440 people in total interacted with the web map and the survey. Participants were able to select one of the following five categories before creating a point on the webmap: add dedicated on-street bike lane, add secure bike parking, improved way to cross the street when biking, improvement to existing bike lane, or other. Adding dedicated bike lanes were the largest concern, followed by improved ways to cross the street. Concerns in the “other” section included traffic calming and speed limit reduction, traffic signal issues, crossing I-5, motorist behavior, missing links in bike networks, and signage/wayfinding.

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY



Webmap comments were spread throughout the city, with the highest concentration in the Central Business District and surrounding areas. The Edgemoor neighborhood had significantly fewer comments than other neighborhoods. Points expressing the need for a dedicated bike lane were highly concentrated along Lakeway Drive and its continuation into East Holly Street and West Holly Street. There is also high demand for bike lanes on Yew Street Road, 32nd Street, 36th Street, James Street, and Meridian Street. Comments expressing the need to improve existing bike lanes were clustered on Northwest Avenue, Lakeway Drive, and South Samish Way. Comments expressing the need for improved bike crossing were primarily clustered at Woburn Street and its intersections at Texas Street, Whatcom Creek, Frasier Street, and Old Woburn Street. Other intersections of high


BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

interest are Ohio Street and Ellis Street and James Street and Kentucky Street. Areas of interest for adding secure bike parking are 10th Street, North State Street, North Commercial Street, and West Laurel Street.

Trails and greenways were another topic of interest in the webmap responses. Many users mentioned a need for a dedicated crossings onto Whatcom Creek Trail from Woburn St. and Meador Ave as well as a crosswalk or bridge connecting the Whatcom Creek Trail to Whatcom Falls. There were also several comments along the Railroad trail, asking for improved crossings, better signage, giving the right of way to trail users rather than cars, and extending the trail to connect to downtown.

Webmap comments on bike parking needs are clustered around the city center, expressing the need for secured parking around retail, entertainment, and recreational centers. There are also comments asking for secure parking near trailheads.

Figure 10: Webmap responses per category




SURVEY AND WEBMAP DEMOGRAPHICS

The survey and web map included optional demographic questions, so this was a unique opportunity to gain insight into their representation in the findings included in this memo. No demographic details were taken for the in-person pop-up event. In addition, demographic questions were optional, so demographics represent only the subset that chose to respond to each specific question.

Race / Ethnicity


The racial makeup of the respondents was somewhat representative of the Bellingham population. In total, 76% of respondents were White/Caucasian compared to Bellingham's average of 78.2%. There was low representation from people of color, slightly lower than Bellingham's averages, including 2% Latinx or Hispanic compared to Bellingham's 6%, and 4% Asian or Pacific Islander compared to Bellingham's 5%. 1% of respondents were Black or African American, which is in line with Bellingham's population. Finally, 12% of respondents choosing to fill out the demographic data preferred not to answer and 2% left the field blank.

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY




Disability Status

Out of survey respondents who chose to respond to this demographic question, 9.5% of people reported having a disability. The other 90.5% did not report a disability. The disabilities reported included but were not limited to vision, hearing and mobility, all of which affected the ways in which people interacted with the city's pedestrian environment. "Other" includes people who wrote in issues related to old age, arthritis, surgery recovery, or Dupuytren's and Ledderhose Disease.



Gender

48% of respondents identified as male, 41% female, 3% gender nonconforming or nonbinary, and 8% preferred not to respond.




Neighborhoods

Survey respondents represented 24 neighborhoods, with a somewhat even spread. Columbia, Sunnyland, and Whatcom Falls were the neighborhoods with the highest representation.

Age


There was representation from all age groups listed, however there was minimal representation from those under 24. 21% of respondents were 35-44, 19% was 25-34, 16% were 55-64, and 16% were 65 and older.

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY



Income

Survey participants tended to be of middle and high income with the highest representation from the \$50,000 - \$90,000 income bracket followed by the \$100,000 - \$149,000 income bracket.



PUBLIC COMMENTS

Write-In Comments

The Bellingham community was invited to add public comment via email or through the Engage Bellingham website. Throughout the comment period (May 2022 – May 2023), we received 161 comments on the Engage Bellingham website and 51 comments through email for both the pedestrian and bicycle plan updates. Through the write-in comments people drew upon their personal experiences of the City to communicate concerns, compliments, and challenges, ranging from traffic calming to gaps in the network to requests for designated and protected bike lanes:

- Specific streets were mentioned by community members as areas that need improved safety. These included the following:
 - Woburn Street
 - Old Woburn Street
 - Cornwall Avenue
 - Samish Way
 - Lakeway Drive
 - Electric Avenue
- Several comments expressed concerns about speeding, traffic calming, and speed limit enforcement. Many commenters mentioned Samish Way as being unsafe due to speeding cars. Other specific areas that were mentioned are 36th St. south of Connelly Ave., Lakeway Drive, Eldridge Ave., Hawthorn Rd., Cedarwood Ave., Cordata Blvd., and near I-5 ramps.

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

- Commenters expressed the need for protected bike lanes across Bellingham as well as connecting bike lanes where there are gaps in the network. Some specific locations that were mentioned are along Alabama St., Lakeway Dr., Meridian St., and Samish Way.
- Accessibility is a topic that was mentioned in several comments. One comment stated that infrastructure should be built so that any child, disabled person, elderly person, or first-time cyclist can use it. Other concerns that were mentioned are improved visibility and ways of crossing, ADA compliant pedestrian and bike bridges, and building safe routes to schools.

Technical Review Committee Meetings

Technical review committee meetings gave way to several insights about community groups experiences and recommendations for a better cycling environment in Bellingham.

The Adaptive and Inclusive Recreation Project of Whatcom County (AIROW) (April 10, 2023) shared challenges and opportunities in the realm of adaptive recreational biking in and around Bellingham. Items discussed in the meeting include:

- Goals for improving biking: accessible trails and adaptive mountain biking
- Challenges: bike lanes stopping before a roundabout, trail etiquette
- Opportunities: Bellingham has potential for being a leader in adaptive mountain biking, make biking safer by increasing the understanding of diversity in disability, using pavement or soft-surface trails rather than gravel so it's easier for adaptive bikes, awareness programs about sharing trails
- Specific locations for bicycle network improvements that would benefit AIROW programming and adaptive biking in Bellingham:
 - Central Ave/Holly St.
 - Railroad Trail/Electric Ave.
 - Trails between Squalicum Creek Park and Birchwood Park.
 - Downtown- Waypoint Park, W. Holly Street crossing
 - Bloedel Donovan Park (Electric Ave) at Railroad Trail to Whatcom Falls
 - Cornwall and W. Laurel
 - Cornwall and W. Laurel

The Mount Baker Bicycle Club (MBBC) (April 17, 2023) discussed challenges faced during group bike rides around Bellingham and recommendations for planning, policy, and infrastructure improvements by the City. Items discussed in the meeting include:

- Challenges: bike safety and security, continued education of both bikers and drivers, road and bike lane maintenance, gaps in the network and lack of connectivity
- Opportunities: having venue-specific parking like valets can encourage people to ride their bikes to events, work with WTA to provide bike parking at transit stations, e-bike education for new riders, police on bicycles to demonstrate how to ride and to help cars see more bikes, employer commute benefits
- Specific locations for bicycle network improvements that would benefit safe and comfortable biking for all in Bellingham:
 - Lakeway corridor
 - Bus stations
 - Bridge on Meador Ave
 - East North St. between Cornwall Ave. and James St.
 - Crossing light exiting Cornwall Park
 - Parts of the Interurban Trail – Boulevard Park is pedestrian heavy

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Walk and Roll Bellingham (April 20, 2023) expressed the need for a mode shift towards active transportation, bicycle-friendly infrastructure, and focusing on equity and connectivity. Items discussed in the meeting include:

- Goals for improving biking: mode shift towards active transportation, active transportation have equal or higher priority in the Right of Way, focus on equity and network connectivity
- Challenges: current infrastructure isn't bike-friendly, I-5 crossings and arterials have a limited amount of space for cyclists to share the road with cars, need for covered bike parking due to frequent inclement weather
- Opportunities: there is an engaged population and bike culture, there is public willingness to remove on-street parking, the city's growth is northward where there is less legacy infrastructure that failed to compensate bikes, there are good partners in nearby jurisdictions that provide and opportunity for synergy at a county-wide level
- Specific locations for bicycle network improvements that would benefit safe and comfortable biking for all in Bellingham:
 - James Street and Kentucky St (cycle track)
 - Texas and Orleans (roundabout)
 - Texas at Pacific (ped beacons with bike buttons)
 - Eastbound Texas and Woburn
 - Texas and Yew
 - Michigan and Alabama (bike buttons)

The Bellingham Chamber of Commerce (June 28, 2023) discussed their longstanding motto of "create places to live, work, play" and how the Chamber's work relates to Bellingham's bicycle network and BMP update. Key takeaways from the meeting include:

- While the City has adequately provided bike infrastructure and positive messaging about biking, there is failure in communication beyond city limits. Bellingham is a regional hub, and drivers and cyclists from other counties may not know how to engage with bike infrastructure that is specific to Bellingham.
- Three things needed to advocate for more biking downtown: more residential units, more public restrooms, more bike racks
- Need to consider how to regulate the integration of bikes on the roadway (bicycle registration, licensing component, permit fees)

3. FEEDBACK ON DRAFT PLAN

PLAN DEVELOPMENT

Once a draft of the Plan was finalized, it was put forth to the public in the Plan Development phase, a second round of community engagement. During this phase, the public was invited to offer feedback on the proposed projects, policies, and program recommendations. Outreach during this second phase was more focused, though the wider community still had opportunities to participate. Residents and groups that had either signed up for updates during the first phase, had a vested interest in the plan, or had technical expertise helped refine the vision. Reviewing the draft Plan is time consuming and the scope of what was asked from the public was much narrower. The aim of the second phase was to get feedback that will help refine the plan, rather than to solicit new ideas for projects or policies.

The following tools were used in the second round of community engagement:

- Interactive Story Map: Explore the vision on a digital map, leave comments, and see how the plan takes shape

- Targeted Surveys: Dive into specific aspects of the plan, provide feedback.
- Virtual Open Houses: Join the project team to ask questions and share thoughts live.
- EngageBellingham Platform: Keep the dialogue going online, anytime, anywhere.
- Technical Review Committees: Reconnect with experts and fine-tune the details.

Technical Review Committees

In addition to the input from the wider community, the project team also reconvened with the Technical Review Committees to get more in-depth feedback and ideas for the Plan. Each group had a particular interest and expertise regarding biking in Bellingham. They were comprised of leaders within various engaged subsets of the community. These groups came to the table with a specialized expertise and were asked to give feedback specific to the groups that they each represent. The project team provided more in-depth presentations and solicited feedback in both the discovery and development phases of the plan.

- Mount Baker Bicycle Club (MBBC) – Dec 6th, 2023
- Walk and Roll Bellingham – Dec 8th, 2023
- Bellingham Chamber of Commerce – Dec 6th, 2023

FEEDBACK ON DRAFT PLAN

This section details the feedback received on the proposed projects, policies, and programs in the draft of the Plan.

Summary of Results

Overall Comments

- 236 total comments
- Open Houses: 59 comments (25%)
- Engage Bellingham: 51 comments (22%)
- Story Map/Survey Responses: 65 comments (27%)
- Sehome Neighborhood Association: 11 comments (5%)
- Walk & Roll Board: 42 comments (18%)
- WSDOT: 8 comments (3%)



Story map

- 1044 views
- 286 survey responses



Engage Bellingham

- 1,281 page views
- 30 comments

Survey Responses




BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY




BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Comments by Topic

This section summarizes overall comments received during phase two of engagement.



Comments about Projects:




The majority of the comments on the plan are focused on specific projects that people liked, didn't like, or felt had been overlooked. Some of the most mentioned locations were:

- Routes around Happy Valley Elementary School
- Connections across Samish Way at Galbraith
- Yew Street and a desire for access to Lake Padden and Galbraith via Yew Street.
- Comments about Lakeway

BICYCLE PLAN COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT SUMMARY

Comments about the Policies:



By far the most common thread we heard was that people wanted bike lanes to be completely separated from traffic lanes and protected by a physical barrier. The most common policy related comments were:

- Non-protected bike lanes do not feel safe
- Road speeds need to be slower
- Need a policy about cleaning bike lanes
- Safe Routes to School needs to be prioritized

Comments about engagement and education:

Several community members expressed that the timing for the engagement was not ideal. In response, the project team extended the comment period by an extra two weeks

- Community engagement period is too short
- Western students are out of session during the comment period
- Engagement shouldn't be over the holiday
- Need driver and biker education

Comments about the prioritization:

Several people expressed that there were not clear metrics the project team was using to make decisions.

- Need more measurable outcomes
- Need more clarity on how routes were prioritized

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Appendix B: Network Prioritization Framework



720 3RD AVENUE
SUITE 2020
SEATTLE, WA 98104

206.297.1601
TOOLEDESIGN.COM

MEMORANDUM

October 4, 2023
To: Riley Grant and Joel Pfundt
Organization: City of Bellingham
From: Michael Hintze, AICP, Ben Silverstein, Toole Design
Project: Bellingham Bicycle Master Plan

Re: Bicycle Network Prioritization Framework

The full completion of the City's bicycle network is a long-term goal. Based on the practical and fiscal limitations, not all bicycle projects can be implemented at once. This prioritization ranking should not be viewed as a mandate to complete projects in a particular order, but rather a measure of which projects best meet the overall goals of the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP). The order in which projects are built will depend on many factors, including budget/cost, local funds and state/federal grant funding availability, active development, and other implementation opportunities (e.g., repaving).

Once the recommended bicycle network is finalized, it will be prioritized based on the criteria in Table 1.

Table 1: Comparison of draft plan update criteria to the criteria used for the 2014 BMP

| Plan Update Draft Prioritization Criteria | 2014 BMP Prioritization Criteria |
|---|--|
| Safety/Comfort: Bike crashes per mile, level of traffic stress | Safety: Bike crashes |
| Equity: Median household income, population under 18, race, low-income housing | High concentration of population under 18, high concentration of low income population |
| Connectivity: Proximity to urban villages, schools, trail access points, parks, transit, connections to low-stress network. | Connectivity: route level of stress and directness |
| Trip Potential: projects near most people (housing units) and jobs | Demand: employment/population density, locations near schools, bike count volumes, locations near trail access points, locations near parks. |

While there are many other criteria that could be included, we seek to keep the framework as simple as possible for two reasons:

1. It will make the prioritization framework more transparent and easier to communicate to the public
2. It will be easier to replicate the prioritization in the future

The prioritization framework will be based on a point system, wherein each criterion will earn a project a certain number of points and the sum of those points will determine where projects are ranked. The table below summarizes the proposed BMP project scoring system:

Table 2: Bicycle project prioritization criteria

| Factor | Criteria | Measure | Points |
|--|--|---|--------|
| Safety (6 points possible) | Crash reduction | Weighted bicycle and pedestrian crashes on a per mile basis based on sliding window analysis | 3 |
| | LTS (Segments Only) | Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress score » 3 points for LTS 4 or 3 | 3 |
| Equity (4 points possible) | Socioeconomic factors | Median household income, population under 18, race » Projects in Census block groups with highest concentration of low-income households | 1 |
| | | » Projects in Census block groups with highest concentration of population under 18 | 1 |
| | | » Projects in Census block groups with highest concentration of BIPOC populations | 1 |
| | | » Project within ¼ mile of low-income housing | 1 |
| Connectivity (9 points possible) | Proximity to parks and trails | Within ¼ mi of trail access point | 1 |
| | | Within ¼ mi of park | 1 |
| | Proximity to schools | Within 1 mile of public school | 1 |
| | Proximity to Urban Villages | Project is inside or within ½ mile of an Urban Village | 2 |
| | Connections to low-stress network | Projects that connect to 1 existing-low-stress segment | 1 |
| | | Projects that connect 2 or more existing low-stress segments | 2 |
| Proximity to transit stops | » Within ¾ mile of High Frequency Transit Network stop | 1 | |
| | » Within 1/2 mile of other bus stop | 1 | |
| Trip Potential (4 points possible) | Population | Projects near the most people measured in housing units are prioritized (housing units within 1/10 mile of location-based need; points assigned based on proportional distribution, e.g., 75% percentile receives 1.5 points. | 2 |
| | Employment | Projects near the most jobs are prioritized (jobs within 1/10 mile of location-based need; points assigned based on proportional distribution, e.g., 75% percentile receives 1.5 points. | 2 |

Methodology

These criteria are applied to all BMP projects using the following methodology:

Safety

The crash reduction criteria uses crash data from WSDOT filtered for bicycle and pedestrian crashes between 2017 and 2021. This analysis counts crashes along 1-mile segments of each roadway, in 1/10th-mile increments, and assigns a score to each roadway segment based on the severity of bicycle and pedestrian crashes. The LTS scores for road segments are calculated based on the number of lanes, speed limit, AADT, bikeway type.

Equity

For Census Block Groups use appropriate low-income threshold from Bellingham’s housing programs (e.g., 80% of median income for 4 person household), under 18 population, and BIPOC population. The rankings are applied to all intersection and corridor projects based on the Census Block Group in which each project is located. For corridor projects that pass through multiple Census Blocks with different ranks, the highest rank along the project corridor is applied. The score is then linearly scaled, such that a project in a Census Block Group with a ranking of 10 will receive all 2 points, while a project in a Census Block Group with a rank of 5 will receive 1 point. The low-income housing criteria score is calculated based on the number of low-income housing units within ¼-mile of the project location. Low-income housing units include rental units built with HOME or HUD funds as well as Section 8 subsidized units that do not overlap with the HOME and HUD units.

Connectivity

Scores for each connectivity criteria are calculated based on the straight-line distance between the intersection or corridor project to each of the key destination types: schools, urban villages, parks and trails, and WTA transit stops. For the purpose of this analysis, the combined parks and trails layer excludes private trails, short neighborhood connectors (e.g., paths connecting adjacent cul-de-sacs), and non-park or private open space (e.g., cemeteries, golf courses, and wooded areas).

Low-stress bikeways that connect to other low-stress bikeways effectively extend the low-stress network, allowing more people of varying ages and abilities to access destinations and meet their daily needs. Recommended segment projects that connect on one end to an existing low-stress bikeway receives 1 point, projects that connect to existing low-stress bikeways on both ends receive 2 points.

Trip Potential

The number of housing units within 1/10th-mile of intersection and corridor projects is calculated using housing unit estimates at the parcel level, provided by the City of Bellingham. Employment within 1/10th-mile is based on 2021 estimates at the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ) level, also provided by the City of Bellingham. These TAZ-level estimates are allocated to projects based on the amount of overlap between the 1/10th-mile radius around the intersection or corridor and the TAZ. For example, if the 1/10th-mile radius area around an intersection project contains 25% of the geographic area of a TAZ, and that TAZ has an estimated 1,000 employees, the intersection project is assigned an employment estimate of 250.

Appendix C: Funding Sources for Bicycle Projects and Programs

Local Funding Sources

Bellingham Street Fund

The Street Fund is comprised of State motor vehicle gas tax funding returned to the City from the State and a percentage of the total annual general sales tax collected by the City of Bellingham. The Street Fund is typically programmed for maintenance and repair expenses (Asphalt resurfacing, concrete repair, etc.) and limited capital improvement projects (ADA ramps, crosswalks, bikeways as part of resurfacing projects, etc.). Projects identified for reconstruction or repaving as part of the capital improvements list should also implement recommendations for pedestrian improvements in order to maximize efficiencies while minimizing local costs.

Bellingham Transportation Fund (T-Fund)

The Transportation Fund is derived from a 2/10 of 1% sales tax receipts collected within city limits to fund the following specific transportation needs: Street Resurfacing; Non-Motorized; and Clean Energy, which includes support of capital investments for WTA transit (ADA upgrades to bus stops, downtown station) and capital investments for transportation-related Climate Action Plan initiatives (EV charging stations). The Transportation Fund sales tax was approved by Bellingham voters in 2020 for a 10-year period and will remain until December 31, 2030.

Bellingham Transportation Impact Fees

The Washington Growth Management Act and RCW 82.02 allow cities to assess Transportation Impact Fees (TIF) for new development that creates impacts to the local citywide transportation system. Cities must conduct studies and adopt TIF ordinances to establish the legal and acceptable proportionate share funding contribution that will be required from new development. Bellingham began assessing TIF with adoption of BMC 19.06 and the 1995 Comprehensive Plan. Several updates have been made to Bellingham's TIF system over the years to incentivize infill development and to focus on moving people.

In 2011, Bellingham adopted the Urban Village TIF Reduction Program based on research that development in compact mixed use Urban Villages generates fewer vehicle trips due to the presence of sidewalks, bikeways, WTA transit, and reduced vehicle parking. This program rewards development in Urban Villages with both automatic and voluntary trip reducing measures that effectively lowers TIF collected when building permits are issued. Since 2011, the Urban Village TIF Reduction Program has incentivized infill development through TIF reductions totaling almost \$2 million dollars. The most recent TIF system change in 2018 transformed the former auto-centric system to a more inclusive multimodal TIF system, which means that new development is contributing to funding for pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure identified in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Master Plans.

Federal Grant Funding Sources

Over the past 15 years, many federal grant funding sources have stemmed from congressional legislation, such as SAFETEA-LU, MAP-21, FAST, and more recently the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL). Some federal funding is administered through the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), which then allocates funding to regional planning agencies, such as the Whatcom Council of Governments (WCOG). Other federal funding can be secured through applications submitted directly to U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) grant programs. Most of these funding programs are oriented toward transportation versus recreation, with an emphasis on reducing auto trips and providing inter-modal connections. Federal funding is intended for capital improvements, and safety and education programs and projects must relate to the surface transportation system. All federal funding specifically requires modification of curb ramps, crosswalks, signals, sidewalks, and driveways to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Surface Transportation Block Grants and Associated Programs

The Surface Transportation Block Grant (STBG), Transportation Alternatives (TA), and Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) all provide states with flexible regional and enhancement funds which may be used for a wide variety of projects on any Federal-aid Highway (federally classified local arterial streets), bridges on any public road, and transit facilities. In the Whatcom region, these grant funds are allocated to jurisdictions through the Whatcom Council of Governments (WCOG), acting in its role as both the state-appointed Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) and the federal Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). Grant funding is awarded to projects through a competitive application process according to scoring criteria established by the WCOG Transportation Technical Advisory Group (TTAG) and approved by the RTPO Policy Board, made up of elected officials throughout the Whatcom region.

STBG project funding is used for multi-modal transportation corridors that provide region-wide benefit and the inclusion of sidewalk or other appropriate pedestrian accommodation is a project requirement for a funding award. STBG funds are most typically used for pedestrian improvements as part of a larger capital improvement project, such as sidewalks or paved shared-use pathways, curb extensions, crosswalks, pedestrian crossing signals, and street lighting complimenting bikeways, and vehicle lane resurfacing or reconstruction. Since 2010, Bellingham has received 11 individual STBG grant funding awards totaling \$17.5 million for regionally important projects, such as James Street, Wharf Roundabout, West Horton Road, Mahogany Road, Orchard Drive, Telegraph Road, James/Bakerview Roundabout, and Meridian/Birchwood Roundabout.

Transportation Alternatives

The Transportation Alternatives (TA) program is a subset of STBG that is focused on smaller or mode-specific project improvements, such as sidewalk or crossing improvements. The amount of TA funding per cycle has typically been very small compared to the STBG allocation for regionally-significant projects. Combined with the reality that the use of federal funding requires additional administrative, engineering, and inspection staff time, TA funding has been much less attractive to the City of Bellingham than STBG funding, but smaller PMP projects may be good candidates for TA funding.

Carbon Reduction Program (CRP)

The Carbon Reduction Program (CRP) is new (2023) federal funding stemming from the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL), which provides funds for projects designed to reduce transportation emissions, defined as carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions from on-road highway (arterial street) sources. A broad spectrum of improvements are eligible for CRP funding, including all projects and activities eligible under STBG and TA programs. WCOG has added the CRP funding to the regional process for allocating federal funding and this CRP may help to implement PMP sidewalk and crossing improvements.

Highway Safety Improvement Program

WSDOT Local Programs administers Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) grant programs with the goal of reducing fatal and serious injury crashes, following Washington state's Strategic Highway Safety Plan (Target Zero) and each agency's Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP).

The WSDOT City Safety Program funds projects in cities every other year. To qualify for eligibility, jurisdictions must first create a Local Road Safety Plan (LRSP) to examine collisions and then develop a systemic approach to making engineering improvements using best practice safety countermeasures in locations where similar conditions exist. Bellingham has created Local Road Safety Plans and received a HSIP grant award of \$900,000 toward the James/Bakerview Roundabout programmed for construction in 2023.

Safe Streets for All (SS4A) Program

A result of the BIL is the SS4A program which is a national compliment to WSDOT's HSIP. The SS4A program funds

both safety planning and project implementation. For implementation funding, it requires a safety planning document, termed a Safety Action Plan, which has additional levels of public outreach, safety planning at the standards and policy level, and reporting requirements, beyond the systemic safety analysis and project identification required for LRSPs. The SS4A program is authorized through Fiscal Year 2026 and for implementation funding it has a minimum project funding request of \$2,500,000 with a 20% local match. SS4A grant requests are prioritized through WCOG.

State Funding Sources

WSDOT Pedestrian and Bicyclist Safety

The goal of the Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety (PBS) program is to improve the transportation system to enhance safety and mobility for people who choose to walk or bike. Since 2005, the program has awarded \$115.6 million for 208 projects from over \$534 million in requests, or 21% of applications from local jurisdictions, making this the most competitive grant funding program in Washington. Bellingham has received several PBS grant awards, such as sidewalks, bikeways, and HAWK signals along Lakeway and Lincoln, as well as sidewalks and bikeways along West Illinois Street.

WSDOT's Railway-Highway Crossing program

WSDOT's Railway-Highway Crossing program provides funding for safety improvements to reduce the number of fatalities, injuries, and crashes where public streets cross railroad tracks and at least 50% of these funds must be used to install or upgrade protective devices at railroad crossings. Improvements to make railway crossings safer can include sign and street marking enhancements, roadway gates, medians, pedestrian crossings, signal systems, and complete grade separation, or closure. Bellingham is working to construct safety improvements at all at-grade public street crossings of the BNSF railroad tracks throughout the Waterfront District and has received HSIP grant awards for the F Street crossing.

WSDOT Safe Routes to School (SRTS)

The purpose of WSDOT's SRTS grant funding program is to improve safety and mobility for children by enabling and encouraging them to walk and bicycle to school. Grant funding from this program is for projects within two-miles of primary, middle, and high schools (K-12). In Washington, the Safe Routes to Schools Program (SRTS) grant funding is a combination of federal and state funding. Bellingham typically receives federal SRTS funding from WSDOT because, per RCW 35.01.010, Bellingham is one of 10 cities in Washington classified as a "First Class City." SRTS is the second most competitive grant program and since 2005, the program has awarded \$135 million for 270 projects from over \$499 million in requests, or 27% of applications from local jurisdictions. Bellingham has received multiple SRTS grant awards for Carl Cozier ES, Shuksan MS, Cordata ES, and Parkview ES.

Transportation Improvement Board

The Transportation Improvement Board (TIB) was created by the Washington State Legislature to encourage state investment in high quality local transportation projects. TIB distributes competitive grant funding generated by statewide gas tax through grant funding awards to cities and counties in defined regions of state. A minimum 20-percent match of local funding is required on all UAP and ATP projects. Since 2006, Bellingham has received \$12.5 million in 19 individual TIB grant funding awards for multimodal transportation improvements from all three of these TIB funding programs.

TIB – Urban Arterial Program

The Urban Arterial Program (UAP) funds corridor and intersection improvements according to scoring criteria in the following categories: Safety, Commercial Growth and Development, Mobility, and Physical Condition. Bellingham competes for UAP grant funding against other cities in the Northwest Region of Washington State, which includes Whatcom, Skagit, San Juan, Island, Kitsap, Jefferson, and Clallam counties.

TIB – Active Transportation Program

In 2022, TIB broadened the Sidewalk Program to the Active Transportation Program (ATP) and it is intended to provide safe sidewalks and bicycle facilities on federally classified routes (principal, minor, or collector). ATP funded projects improve safety, access, connectivity, and continuity while conforming to standards created by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Bellingham competes for ATP grant funding against all other cities in the Western Region of Washington State, which includes all counties west of the Cascade Mountains.

TIB – Complete Streets

In 2011, Washington passed the Complete Streets Act (RCW 47.04.320 -.340), which encourages local jurisdictions to adopt Complete Streets ordinances and established a grant funding program that requires an adopted ordinance for eligibility. Bellingham’s policies and practices have incorporated Complete Streets principals since the adoption of the 2006 Comprehensive Plan, but the City had not officially adopted the label of Complete Streets. In 2016, with the update of the Comprehensive Plan, Bellingham adopted a “Complete Networks” ordinance recognizing the various defined modal networks (Pedestrian, Bicycle, Trail, Transit, Automobile, and Freight) and establishing a transportation modal hierarchy that emphasizes pedestrian safety above all else while also recognizing the need to balance the needs of all modes so that the citywide transportation system works for all users.

The TIB Complete Streets (CS) grant program was suspended in 2020 but is expected to be reinstated in 2024 with a more traditional project application process than the nomination and award process in previous years. Details of the priority project types, requirements for application, match requirements and policy requirements have yet to be announced. Bellingham has previously secured TIB Complete Street grant awards of \$500,000 during each of the 2017, 2019, and 2021 funding cycles. The City has constructed sidewalks (Vallette), paved multiuse pathways (Lakeway), flashing crosswalks (W. North), and bike boulevards (Old Lakeway) with TIB Complete Streets grant funding.

Traffic Safety Grants

The Washington Traffic Safety Commission (WTSC) provides state funding for programs, projects, services, and strategies to reduce the number of deaths and serious injuries that result from traffic crashes, consistent with Washington’s Target Zero Highway Safety Plan. This is a very important funding source for public safety campaigns involving educators, advocates, and law enforcement officers. Since 2010, Bellingham has received several significant traffic safety grants to create and promote public safety campaigns such as the “See and Be Seen” promotion of headlamps and rear beacons for bicyclists; the “Travel With Care” promotion that all users have rights and responsibilities; and the “Protecting Mobility For All” promotion to focus more driver attention on vulnerable users, including pedestrian and bicyclists, near school zones, parks, transit routes, and neighborhoods. While the funds from Traffic Safety Grants are an important component of an overall safe approach to developing and encouraging pedestrian networks and activity, these Grants are ineligible for application to engineering projects.

Other State Grants

There are other State grant funding sources available to Bellingham, but they are not offered as frequently or accessed as often as those listed above. Some examples include:

- Community Economic Revitalization Board
- Public Works Trust Fund
- Legislative line item funding

Regional Funding Sources

Whatcom County Economic Development Investment (EDI) Board

Enacted in 1997 with the goal of improving rural economies, the EDI Program authorizes counties to retain a portion of collected taxes to finance public facilities. The EDI Program provides financing to public agencies or local governments through very low interest loans, grants, or a combination of both. Relevant eligible public facilities include roads, bridges, storm sewer facilities, and transportation infrastructure. The minimum project size that EDI will fund is \$25,000. Bellingham has received EDI funds for the Depot Market Square (Farmer’s Market) and the West Bakerview Overpass, which added a new 6-foot sidewalk on the north side of the West Bakerview bridge over I-5 where there are currently no sidewalks.

Real Estate Excise Tax (REET)

All cities and counties may levy a quarter percent tax (described as “the first quarter percent of the real estate excise tax” or “REET 1”). Cities and counties that are planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) have the authority to levy a second quarter percent tax (REET 2). The City of Bellingham receives revenues from Whatcom County’s Real Estate Excise Tax under both REET 1 and 2. Jurisdictions must spend the first and second quarter percent of their real estate excise tax receipts solely on capital projects that are listed in the capital facilities plan element of their comprehensive plan. RCW 82.46.010(6) defines “capital projects” as those public works projects of a local government for planning, acquisition, construction, reconstruction, repair, replacement, rehabilitation, or improvement of streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, bridges, domestic water systems, storm and sanitary sewer systems, parks, recreational facilities, law enforcement facilities, fire protection facilities, trails, libraries, and administrative and judicial facilities. Between 2000 and 2008, the City of Bellingham used REET funds to help construct pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, including filling many gaps in the sidewalk network in the downtown and “Arts District.” Since 2009, however, REET funds have been eliminated from the annual six-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as a funding source due to the collapse of home sales and because of commitments made of REET funds for the Bellingham Waterfront district redevelopment.

Other Non-Traditional Funding Sources

Local Businesses

There is increasing corporate and business involvement in sidewalk and trail connection projects that benefit walking. Employers recognize that creating places to walk is one way to build community and attract a quality work force. Outdoor recreation businesses often support local projects and programs.

One example of a local business that has pro-actively invested in the construction of public sidewalks, crossing improvements, and trails is the Barkley Company in the Barkley Urban Village. Over the past several years, the Barkley Company has constructed new sidewalk along the south side of Barkley Boulevard, a significant new multiuse trail connection between Barkley Boulevard and the Railroad Trail, and multiple flashing crosswalks across Barkley Boulevard at Manning, Rimland, and St. Clair.

City staff has also worked with other local developers to pro-actively identify needs for sidewalks, crossings, bikeways, and trails in new subdivisions and developments in the Cordata, King Mountain, and Samish Neighborhoods.

Community Fundraising

Community fundraising and creative partnerships are plentiful. A common approach is to find creative ways to break a large project into small pieces that can be “purchased” by the public. One example is selling bricks for local sidewalk projects, especially those in historic areas or on downtown Main Streets. Donor names are engraved in each brick, and a tremendous amount of publicity and community support is purchased along with basic construction materials. Portland, Oregon’s downtown Pioneer Square is a good example of such a project. The Fairhaven Village Green, the Depot Market Square, and the new 170-stall parking lot at Lake Padden Park-Galbraith Lane have all been the beneficiaries of significant and successful community fundraising efforts in this fashion.

Appendix D: Project Lists

Bicycle Network Spot Improvements

| Project ID | Location | Recommendation | Cost | Priority Ranking* | Priority Level |
|------------|--|---|--|-------------------|----------------|
| 60 | Lincoln St / Fraser St | Install Signal with Crossbike or roundabout | \$1,000,000 | 14 | High |
| 5 | Ellis St / Potter St / Magnolia St | New crosswalk with crossbike on south leg of Ellis St, short section of barrier protected 2-way bike connection painted green on NE corner | \$150,000 | 13 | High |
| 62 | Cornwall Ave / Ohio St | Perimeter-lit NTORs on mast arm, evaluate LPI, add bike signal heads tied to LPI | \$30,000 | 13 | High |
| 106 | Lincoln St / Potter St | Install signal (or roundabout) | \$2,500,000 | 13 | High |
| 14 | Cornwall Ave / W North St | Add crosswalks/crossbikes and RRFBs to both legs of Cornwall; add push button activation for EB and WB bicyclists | \$150,000 | 12 | High |
| 15 | Ellis St / Alabama St | Alabama corridor study for feasibility of BikeHawks | \$50,000 | 12 | High |
| 11 | Kentucky St / James St | BikeRRFB (when James St. road diet is installed) | \$150,000 | 12 | High |
| 4 | Ellis St / York St / Forest St | Extend curb between York and Ellis to create 2-stage NB bike movement, force motorist to approach Ellis crossing at more 90 degree angle. | \$50,000 | 12 | High |
| 26 | Woburn St / Texas St | Move curbs, install bikeRRFB | \$200,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 108 | James St / Meador Ave | Install signal (or roundabout) | \$2,500,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 42 | State St / Meador Ave / Grant St / Kansas St | Add crossbikes to State St crosswalks, add bike boxes | \$150,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 107 | King St / Potter St / I-5 NB Ramps | Construct compact roundabout and reconfigure I-5 northbound ramps | \$2,500,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 110 | N Samish Way / Abbott St | Install traffic signal | \$1,000,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 19 | Lakeway Dr / Puget St | Change NTOR static sign to blankout, tied to bike detection/pushbutton | \$15,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 18 | Lakeway Dr / Lincoln St | Rechannelize/expand intersection to provide protected bicycle lanes at the intersection | \$5,000,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 54 | Northwest Ave / Bakerview Rd | Evaluate shortening both SB and NB right turn pockets on Northwest; restricting NB left-turns into Jack in the Box, eliminating TWCTL add median or hardened centerline | \$50,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 81 | Sunset Dr / Orleans St | Continue bike lanes on north and south leg of Orleans St | \$10,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 80 | Sunset Dr / Barkley Blvd / James St | Continue bike lanes on north and south leg of James St | \$10,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 33 | Northwest Ave / Birchwood Ave | Extend BL through intersection, eliminate WB RTL | \$20,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 111 | N Samish Way / Consolidation Ave | Install traffic signal | \$1,000,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 101 | Moore St / Alabama St | Alabama corridor study for feasibility of BikeHawks | Included in cost figure for Project ID 15 at Ellis St / Alabama St | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 16 | Grant St / Alabama St | Alabama corridor study for feasibility of BikeHawks | Included in cost figure for Project ID 15 at Ellis St / Alabama St | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 44 | Samish Way / McDonald Pkwy | Remove northernmost portion of right turn lane on s leg to eliminate long conflict area between bike lane and right turn lane | \$10,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 64 | Lakeway Dr / Birch St | Add bike boxes, evaluate LPI, add bike signal heads tied to LPI at Lakeway/Birch to all directions | \$40,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |

*Priority ranking is based on how well a given project aligns with the BMP's four goals, based on criteria that are explained in Appendix B.

Bicycle Network Spot Improvements

| Project ID | Location | Recommendation | Cost | Priority Ranking* | Priority Level |
|------------|--|---|---|-------------------|----------------|
| 52 | Samish Way / Larrabee Ave / 36th St | Marked crosswalk with RRFB | \$50,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 73 | James St / North St | Convert RRFB to Bike with split color crossing, protected space on either leg of North St, added bike pushbuttons | \$150,000 | 9 | Low |
| 46 | Samish Way / Lincoln St | Evaluate and implement LPI, add bike signal heads tied to LPI on SB Samish and SB Lincoln approaches to facilitate movement from Samish to Lincoln. Add other approaches as other facilities come online. | \$40,000 | 8 | Low |
| 23 | Electric Ave / Portal Dr | Add short segment on south side of Electric Ave from marked crosswalk adjacent to bus pullout to connect to Birch BLs | \$50,000 | 8 | Low |
| 28 | Michigan St / Alabama St | Alabama corridor study for feasibility of BikeHawks | <i>Included in cost figure for Project ID 15 at Ellis St / Alabama St</i> | 7 | Low |
| 79 | Meridian St / Kellogg Rd | Add corner protection islands | \$50,000 | 7 | Low |
| 48 | Old Fairhaven Pkwy / 24th St | Install Bike RRFB on east side with green boxes, bike pushbuttons | \$150,000 | 7 | Low |
| 53 | Northwest Ave / Aldrich Rd | Add RRFB on north leg | \$50,000 | 7 | Low |
| 6 | Lakeway Dr / Woburn St / Yew St / Old Lakeway Dr | Reconstruct signal and all four corners to accommodate bikes. | \$2,000,000 | 6 | Low |
| 51 | Samish Way / Galbraith Ln | Marked crosswalk with RRFB | \$50,000 | 5 | Low |

Bicycle Network Linear Projects

| Project ID | Segment | From | To | Recommendation | Cost | Priority Ranking* | Priority Level |
|------------|---|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 14 | Holly Street | Broadway St | Ellis St | Separated Bike Lane | \$530,000 | 19 | High |
| 30 | Old Fairhaven Parkway | 12th St | 32nd St | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,600,000 | 19 | High |
| 3 | State Street | Berry St | Holly St | Separated Bike Lane | \$180,000 | 19 | High |
| 58 | Magnolia Street | Champion St | Ellis St | Separated Bike Lane | \$190,000 | 18 | High |
| 1 | Prospect Street | C St | Bay St | Bike Lane | \$100,000 | 18 | High |
| 63 | Lakeway Drive [a] | Ellis St | Puget St | Separated Bike Lane | \$52,000,000 | 18 | High |
| 63 | Lakeway Drive [a] | Humboldt St | James St | Further Study Needed | <i>Project completed 2022</i> | 18 | High |
| 208 | Chestnut Street | Key St | Ellis St | Bike Lane | \$9,000 | 18 | High |
| 46 | Cornwall Avenue [d] | Champion St | Chestnut St | Bike Lane | \$90,000 | 18 | High |
| 62 | Commercial Street | Young St | Chestnut St | Bike Lane | \$160,000 | 17 | High |
| 28 | 32nd Street [a] | Fielding Ave | Donovan Ave | Bike Lane | \$240,000 | 17 | High |
| 227 | 32nd Street [b] | Donovan Ave | Old Fairhaven Pkwy | Bike Boulevard | \$14,000 | 17 | High |
| 217 | Chestnut Street | Granary Ave | Bay St | Further Study Needed | \$50,000 | 17 | High |
| 45 | Cornwall Avenue [c] | Ohio St | Champion St | Bike Lane | \$70,000 | 17 | High |
| 21 | F Street | Alabama St | Roeder Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$370,000 | 17 | High |
| 61 | Bill McDonald Parkway | 21st St | S Samish Way | Separated Bike Lane | \$3,000,000 | 17 | High |
| 191 | Champion Street [a] | Holly St | Prospect St | Bike Lane | \$17,000 | 16 | High |
| 191 | Champion Street [b] | Prospect St | Bay St | Bike Lane | \$12,000 | 16 | High |
| 191 | Champion Street [c] | Bay St | Grand Ave | Shared Lane Markings | \$1,500 | 16 | High |
| 191 | Champion Street [d] | Grand Ave | Commercial St | Shared Lane Markings | \$1,500 | 16 | High |
| 191 | Champion Street [e] | Commercial St | Unity St | Bike Lane | \$17,000 | 16 | High |
| 59 | Flora Street | Prospect St | Cornwall Ave | Shared Lane Markings | \$10,000 | 16 | High |
| 22 | Samish Way | Elwood Ave | Yew St | Separated Bike Lane | \$35,700,000 | 16 | High |
| 50 | James Street [c] | Illinois St | Iowa St | Separated Bike Lane | \$420,000 | 16 | High |
| 85 | Maple Street | (dead end on Maple St at Abbot St) | (dead end on maple west of Lincoln) | Further Study Needed | \$500,000 | 16 | High |
| 85 | Maple Street | N Samish Way | Lincoln St | Separated Bike Lane | \$500,000 | 16 | High |
| 33 | 12th Street [b] | Old Fairhaven Pkwy | Park Ridge Rd | Bike Lane | \$31,000 | 16 | High |
| 225 | 12th Street [a] | Mill Ave | Old Fairhaven Pkwy | Further Study Needed | \$100,000 | 16 | High |
| 220 | Maple St | North Samish Way | Ellis St | Separated Bike Lane | \$17,000 | 16 | High |
| 220 | North Samish Way | 36th St | Maple St | Separated Bike Lane | \$60,000 | 16 | High |
| 97 | Cedarwood Avenue | Bennet Dr | Northwest Ave | Bike Lane | \$1,700,000 | 16 | High |
| 190 | Bay Street | Chestnut St | Champion St | Shared Lane Markings | \$9,000 | 16 | High |
| 55 | York Street [b] | Grant St | King St | Bike Boulevard | \$18,000 | 15 | High |
| 29 | Donovan Avenue | 21st St | 32nd St | Further Study Needed | \$100,000 | 15 | High |
| 108 | Squalicum Way | Roeder Ave | Meridian St | Multi-Use Trail | \$5,400,000 | 15 | High |
| 35 | Harris Avenue [b] | 10th St | 14th St | Further Study Needed | \$150,000 | 15 | High |
| 10 | Bakerview Road | Deemer Rd | I-5 | Separated Bike Lane | \$3,000,000 | 15 | High |
| 213 | Northwest Avenue | Beaumont Dr (city border) | Elm St | Separated Bike Lane | \$350,000 | 15 | High |
| 213 | Northwest Avenue | (roundabout south of Sterling) | (roundabout at McLeod) | Further Study Needed | \$350,000 | 15 | High |
| 52 | James Street [e] | Meador Ave | Gladstone St | Bike Boulevard | \$17,000 | 15 | High |
| 38 | Boulevard-South State Street | Wharf Street Roundabout | 14th St | Multi-Use Trail | \$730,000 | 15 | High |
| 36 | Harris Avenue [c] | 14th St | 21st St | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,100,000 | 15 | High |
| 44 | Cornwall Avenue [b] | Illinois St | Ohio St | Separated Bike Lane | \$620,000 | 14 | High |
| 42 | Garden Street | Cedar St | 14th St | Bike Boulevard | \$70,000 | 14 | High |
| 57 | Potter Street | Ellis St | Humboldt St | Bike Boulevard | \$7,000 | 14 | High |
| 18 | East Sunset Drive | James St | Barkley Blvd | Further Study Needed | \$200,000 | 14 | High |
| 18 | East Sunset Drive | James St | Orleans St | Separated Bike Lane | \$200,000 | 14 | High |
| 17 | East Sunset Drive | Illinois St | James St | Separated Bike Lane | \$240,000 | 14 | High |
| 54 | York Street [a] | Ellis St | Grant St | Separated Bike Lane | \$60,000 | 14 | High |
| 32 | 21st Street | Bill McDonald Pkwy | Donovan Ave | Bike Lane | \$150,000 | 14 | High |
| 13 | State Street | James St/Iowa St | Kansas St | Separated Bike Lane | \$50,000 | 14 | High |
| 60 | South Samish Way | 36th St | Lincoln St | Further Study Needed | \$150,000 | 14 | High |
| 47 | Cornwall Avenue [e] | Chestnut St | Laurel St | Bike Lane | \$30,000,000 | 14 | High |
| 143 | Monroe Street | Lafayette St | Broadway | Bike Boulevard | \$70,000 | 14 | High |
| 51 | James Street [d] | Iowa St | Meador Ave | Further Study Needed | \$150,000 | 14 | High |
| 43 | Cornwall Avenue [a] | [Parkview Elementary School] | Illinois St | Bike Lane | \$36,000 | 14 | High |
| 140 | McLeod Road | Northwest Ave | Bennett Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$60,000 | 14 | High |
| 19 | Squalicum Parkway | Birchwood Ave | Ellis St | Multi-Use Trail | \$4,300,000 | 14 | High |
| 7 | Lakeway Drive [b] | Puget St | Old Lakeway Dr | Multi-Use Trail | \$3,300,000 | 14 | High |
| 34 | Harris Avenue [a] | 4th St | 10th St | Further Study Needed | \$150,000 | 14 | High |
| 192 | Grand Ave | Champion St | Girard St | Separated Bike Lane | \$110,000 | 14 | High |
| 128 | Nequalicum Ave/Patton St/Pinewood Ave/Cottonwood Ave/Cherrywood Ave | Eldridge Ave | Alderwood Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$90,000 | 14 | High |
| 66 | Woburn Street | Sunset Dr | Illinois St | Separated Bike Lane | \$520,000 | 14 | High |

*Priority ranking is based on how well a given project aligns with the BMP's four goals, based on criteria that are explained in Appendix B.

*Priority ranking is based on how well a given project aligns with the BMP's four goals, based on criteria that are explained in Appendix B.

Bicycle Network Linear Projects

| Project ID | Segment | From | To | Recommendation | Cost | Priority Ranking* | Priority Level |
|------------|---------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| 39 | South State Street | 14th St | Adams Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$200,000 | 14 | High |
| 146 | H Street | North St | Holly St | Bike Boulevard | \$59,000 | 14 | High |
| 202 | 10th Street [a] | Mill Ave | Harris Ave | Shared Lane Markings | \$2,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 202 | 10th Street [b] | Harris Ave | McKenzie Ave | Bike Lane | \$9,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 40 | 11th Street | Adams Ave | Douglas Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$200,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 71 | Barkley Boulevard | Woburn St | Brandywine Way | Separated Bike Lane | \$130,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 2 | Kentucky Street | Cornwall Ave | Nevada St | Bike Boulevard | \$33,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 67 | Woburn Street | Illinois St | Texas St | Bike Lane | \$120,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 12 | Iowa Street [b] | Pacific St | Woburn St | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,100,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 209 | West College Way | Highland Dr | Bill McDonald Pkwy | Climbing Lane | \$42,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 53 | James Street [e] | Gladstone St | Potter St | Bike Boulevard | \$14,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 147 | G Street | North St | Dupont St | Bike Boulevard | \$48,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 64 | Pacific Street | (cul de sac on Pacific south of Barkley) | (dead end on Pacific north of Illinois) | Multi-Use Trail | \$160,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 64 | Pacific Street | Barkley Blvd | Alabama St | Bike Lane | \$160,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 25 | Lincoln Street | Maple St | Elwood Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,000,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 48 | James Street [a] | Gooding Ave | Birchwood Ave | Multi-Use Trail | \$15,180,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 211 | Fraser Street [a] | Woburn St | Valencia St-Arbor Ct | Bike Lane | \$15,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 211 | Fraser Street [b] | Valencia St-Arbor Ct | (Regency Park Apartments entrance) | Shared Lane Markings | \$6,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 76 | Bennett Drive | Airport Dr | Marine Dr | Separated Bike Lane | \$360,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 101 | State Street | York St | Holly St | Separated Bike Lane | \$100,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 56 | Potter Street | Humboldt St | James St | Bike Boulevard | \$7,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 69 | Barkley Boulevard | Orleans St | St Paul St | Separated Bike Lane | \$3,200,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 131 | Meridian Street [b] | McCleod Rd | Birchwood Ave | Multi-Use Trail | \$1,400,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 106 | Meador Ave | James St | Fraser St | Multi-Use Trail | \$1,800,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 214 | Meridian Street [c] | Birchwood Ave | Victor St | Separated Bike Lane | \$120,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 216 | Meridian Street [d] | Victor St | Illinois St | Bike Lane | <i>Project completed 2024</i> | 13 | Medium-High |
| 65 | Pacific Street | Alabama St | Iowa St | Bike Lane | \$120,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 78 | Kulshan Street | Oregon St | Broadway | Bike Boulevard | \$60,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 170 | Adams Ave | State St | 14th St | Bike Boulevard | \$12,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 117 | Iron Gate Road | Bay-to-Baker Trail | Hannegan Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$9,000,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 27 | Fielding Avenue | 32nd St | 36th St | Separated Bike Lane | \$130,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 74 | Illinois Street | Lynn St | Sunset Dr | Bike Lane | <i>Project funded and in design</i> | 13 | Medium-High |
| 189 | Billy Frank Jr Street | Maple St | Ellis St | Bike Lane | \$80,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 5 | Lakeway Drive [e] | Silver Beach Rd | Electric Ave | Multi-Use Trail | \$2,600,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 5 | Lakeway Drive [f] | Electric Ave | Scenic Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$250,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 72 | Barkley Boulevard | Brandywine Way | Westridge Pl | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,900,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 95 | Texas Street | Moore St | Michigan St | Bike Boulevard | \$40,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 24 | Lincoln Street | Lakeway Dr | 5th St | Separated Bike Lane | \$130,000 | 13 | Medium-High |
| 102 | State Street | Kansas St | York St | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,500,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 9 | Aldrich Road | Horton Rd | Northwest Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$4,500,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 145 | North St / Logan St / J St / North St | Vallette St | Cornwall Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$33,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 148 | Carolina Street | Cornwall Ave | Lincoln St | Bike Boulevard | \$44,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 16 | Bakerview Road | Deemer Rd | Bay-to-Baker Trail | Separated Bike Lane | \$10,900,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 8 | Electric Avenue | Alabama St | Lakeway Dr | Separated Bike Lane | \$38,500,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 130 | Birchwood Avenue | Northwest Ave | Meridian St | Bike Lane | \$170,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 6 | Lakeway Drive [d] | Yew St - Woburn St | Silver Beach Rd | Multi-Use Trail | \$1,500,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 207 | High Street | Oak St | Highland Dr | Further Study Needed | \$100,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 11 | Iowa Street [a] | Moore St | Pacific St | Further Study Needed | \$50,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 168 | Railroad Avenue | Laurel St | York St | Further Study Needed | \$150,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 193 | Ohio Street | Grant St | State St | Bike Lane | \$32,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 182 | Alderwood Ave | Bennett Dr | Airport Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$47,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 197 | Cordata Pakrway [a] | Roundabout at Kellogg Rd and Cordata Pkwy | n/a | Separated Bike Lane | \$7,500,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 197 | Cordata Pakrway [b] | Kellogg Rd | Westerly Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$975,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 197 | Cordata Pakrway [c] | Roundabout at Westerly Rd and Cordata Pkwy | n/a | Separated Bike Lane | \$7,500,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 197 | Cordata Pakrway [d] | Kellogg Rd | Bakerview Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$105,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 197 | Cordata Pakrway [e] | Bakerview Rd | E Bellis Fair Pkwy | Separated Bike Lane | \$487,500 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 164 | Potter Street | Lincoln St | Puget St | Bike Boulevard | \$23,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 149 | Lincoln St | North St | Iowa St | Bike Boulevard | \$41,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 184 | Hollywood Avenue / McAlpine Road | Marine Dr | Alderwood Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$38,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 201 | Airport Drive | Marine Dr | Bennett Dr | Separated Bike Lane | \$8,300,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 134 | Bellis Fair Parkway | Cordata Pkwy | I-5 NB Off-Ramp | Separated Bike Lane | \$360,000 | 12 | Medium-High |
| 23 | Samish Way | Yew St | Galbraith Ln | Bike Lane | \$6,100,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 41 | Finnegan Way | Douglas Ave | Mill Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,500,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 49 | James Street [b] | Sunset Dr | Illinois St | Further Study Needed | \$50,000 | 11 | Medium-High |
| 185 | Douglas Avenue [a] | 21st St | 24th St | Bike Boulevard | \$15,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |

Bicycle Network Linear Projects

| Project ID | Segment | From | To | Recommendation | Cost | Priority Ranking* | Priority Level |
|------------|---|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|
| 228 | Douglas Avenue [b] | 24th St | 30th St | Multi-Use Trail | \$2,900,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 100 | E Bellis Fair Parkway | Cordata Pkwy | Deemer Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$3,100,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 195 | Yew Street | Woburn St | Alabama St | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,300,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 77 | Lakeway Drive [c] | Old Lakeway Dr | Yew St - Woburn St | Multi-Use Trail | \$6,400,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 70 | Barkley Boulevard | St Paul St | Woburn St | Separated Bike Lane | \$350,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 133 | Telegraph Road | I-5 NB Off-Ramp | Deemer Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,700,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 169 | Highland Drive | W College Way | Knox Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$62,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 172 | 20th Street / Knox Avenue | 14th St | Taylor Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$42,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 31 | Connelly Avenue | 32nd St | 33rd St | Further Study Needed | \$125,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 31 | Connelly Avenue | 33rd St | 36th St | Separated Bike Lane | \$125,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 176 | 21st Street / Wilson Ave / 19th Street | Donovan Ave | Cowgill Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$16,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 144 | West Street | North St | Eldridge Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$23,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 73 | Barkley Boulevard | Westridge Pl | Britton Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,700,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 94 | (wooded area) | (end of Xenia) | Yew St/Alvarado Dr | Multi-Use Trail | \$280,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 94 | (wooded area) | Raymond St/Whatcom St | (end of Birch) | Multi-Use Trail | \$280,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 94 | Xenia St / Alvarado Dr / Edwards St / Roland St / Whatcom St / Birch St | Old Lakeway Dr | Lakeway Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$110,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 203 | 14th Street | Old Fairhaven Pkwy | Wilson Ave | Shared Lane Markings | \$2,000 | 11 | Medium-Low |
| 79 | Oregon Street | Vallette St | Victor St | Bike Boulevard | \$26,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 107 | East Sunset Drive | Woburn St | McCleod Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$250,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 206 | Cedar Street | State St | Garden St | Bike Boulevard | \$10,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 4 | Lakeway Drive [g] | Scenic Ave | Euclid Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$160,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 103 | Kellogg Road | Cordata Pkwy | Guide Meridian Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$120,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 150 | Moore Street | Kentucky St | Iowa St | Bike Boulevard | \$7,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 161 | Michigan / Kentucky / St Clair / Iowa / Rodohendron | Texas St | Railroad Trail | Bike Boulevard | \$80,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 104 | Kellogg Road | Guide Meridian Rd | Tull Rd | Bike Lane | \$41,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 204 | Taylor Avenue | 20th St | 21st St | Multi-Use Trail | \$750,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 26 | 36th Street | S Samish Way | Fielding Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$640,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 171 | 10th Street | State St | Douglas Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$25,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 137 | 30th Street | Old Samish Rd | Donovan Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,500,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 200 | Pacific Highway | Bakerview Rd | Slater Rd | Bike Lane | <i>Project beyond City boundary, not costed</i> | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 175 | Harris Avenue | 21st St | 24th St | Bike Boulevard | \$15,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 224 | Wharf Street | Cornwall Ave | State St | Further Study Needed | \$250,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 160 | Valencia Street | Texas St | Kentucky St | Bike Boulevard | \$21,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 179 | Fieldston Road / Viewcrest Road | Chuckanut Dr | Hawthorne Rd | Bike Boulevard | \$90,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 174 | McKenzie Avenue | 24th St | 32nd St | Bike Boulevard | \$23,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 126 | Birchwood Avenue | Greenwood Ave | Cedarwood Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$60,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 129 | Texas Street | Moore St | Lincoln St | Further Study Needed | \$500,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 86 | Gladstone Street / Toledo Court | Puget St | Lakeway Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$33,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 82 | Moore Street | Illinois St | Railroad Trail | Multi-Use Trail | \$320,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 132 | Meridian Street [a] | Telegraph Rd | McCleod Rd | Further Study Needed | \$175,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 178 | Donovan Avenue | 4th St | 10th St | Bike Boulevard | \$22,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 87 | Silver Beach Road | Lakeway Dr | [end of road] | Shared Lane Markings | \$23,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 99 | Nevada St | Whatcom St | Lakeway Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$10,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 118 | Hannegan Road | Sunset Dr | Bakerview Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$23,700,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 123 | Northshore Drive | Flint St | Britton Rd | Bike Lane | \$990,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 165 | Orleans Street | Potter St | Lakeway Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$8,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 15 | Whatcom Street | Puget St | Woburn St | Bike Boulevard | \$19,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 212 | Willow Road [a] | Fieldston Rd | Cypress Rd | Bike Lane | \$80,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 212 | Willow Road [b] | Cypress Rd | Chuckanut Dr | Bike Lane | \$390,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 98 | North Street | Kulshan St | Valette St | Bike Boulevard | \$13,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 188 | Cornwall Avenue | Pine St | end of road | Separated Bike Lane | \$550,000 | 10 | Medium-Low |
| 139 | McLeod Road | Meridian St | Northwest Ave | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,100,000 | 9 | Medium-Low |
| 177 | 4th Street / Bayside Road | Harris Ave | Hawthorne Rd | Bike Boulevard | \$53,000 | 9 | Medium-Low |
| 84 | UROW Byron Ave / 45th St / Consolidation Ave | 44th St | Puget St | Multi-Use Trail | \$160,000 | 9 | Medium-Low |
| 83 | Iron St / Maryland St / King St | Illinois St | Railroad Trail | Bike Boulevard | \$29,000 | 9 | Medium-Low |
| 105 | Kellogg Road | Deemer Rd | Creston Wy | Separated Bike Lane | \$700,000 | 9 | Medium-Low |
| 162 | Valencia Street | Iowa St | Fraser St | Bike Boulevard | \$25,000 | 9 | Medium-Low |
| 155 | Saint Clair Street | Illinois St | Saint Clair Pl | Bike Boulevard | \$16,000 | 9 | Low |
| 205 | Puget Street | Lakeway Dr | Consolidation Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$44,000 | 9 | Low |

Bicycle Network Linear Projects

| Project ID | Segment | From | To | Recommendation | Cost | Priority Ranking* | Priority Level |
|------------|---|-------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|---|-------------------|----------------|
| 153 | Brandywine Way / Vining Street | Barkley Blvd | Railroad Trail entrance | Bike Boulevard | \$20,000 | 9 | Low |
| 96 | Texas Street | Michigan St | Erie St | Bike Boulevard | \$20,000 | 9 | Low |
| 68 | Barkley Boulevard | Sunset Dr | Orleans St | Separated Bike Lane | \$120,000 | 9 | Low |
| 198 | Deemer Road | Kellogg Rd | Telegraph Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$830,000 | 9 | Low |
| 159 | Yew Street | Alabama St | Roosevelt Elementary School entrance | Bike Boulevard | \$20,000 | 9 | Low |
| 20 | Squalicum Parkway | Ellis St | [cul de sac] | Bike Lane | \$90,000 | 9 | Low |
| 124 | Northshore Drive | Britton Rd | City Limit | Bike Lane | \$3,600,000 | 9 | Low |
| 89 | Heights Drive | Crestline Dr | Illinois Ln | Bike Boulevard | \$17,000 | 9 | Low |
| 151 | Moore Street | Illinois St | Moore-to-Orleans Connector Trail | Bike Boulevard | \$6,000 | 9 | Low |
| 186 | East College Way | S College Dr | (steam plant) | Shared Lane Markings | \$11,000 | 9 | Low |
| 75 | Bakerview Road | Bennett Dr | Pacific Hwy | Separated Bike Lane | \$40,000,000 | 9 | Low |
| 90 | Illinois Lane | Vining St | Heights Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$6,000 | 9 | Low |
| 136 | Old Samish Road | Chuckanut Dr | City Limit | Paved Shoulder | \$4,100,000 | 9 | Low |
| 194 | Racine Street | Iowa St | Bellingham St | Shared Lane Markings | \$5,000 | 8 | Low |
| 93 | York St / Lowell Ave | Electric Ave | Lakeway Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$34,000 | 8 | Low |
| 166 | Toledo St / Lopez Ct / Racine St | Whatcom St | Consolidation Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$45,000 | 8 | Low |
| 81 | UROW Barnes Rd / Eliza Ave | Eliza Ave | Park Place Apartments | Multi-Use Trail | \$1,700,000 | 8 | Low |
| 135 | Sterling Drive | Northwest Ave | Bellis Fair Pkwy | Bike Boulevard | \$41,000 | 8 | Low |
| 120 | Saint Clair Street | Barkley Blvd | Sunset Dr | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,500,000 | 8 | Low |
| 173 | Taylor Avenue / 30th Street | 32nd St | Douglas Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$13,000 | 8 | Low |
| 142 | Lafayette Street | Eldridge Ave | Monroe St | Bike Boulevard | \$4,000 | 8 | Low |
| 156 | Illinois Street | Saint Clair St | Michigan St | Bike Boulevard | \$9,000 | 8 | Low |
| 221 | Newton Street | Whatcom St | San Juan Blvd | Bike Boulevard | \$32,000 | 8 | Low |
| 222 | San Juan Boulevard | Yew St | Pacificview Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$29,000 | 8 | Low |
| 119 | Division Street | Iron Gate Rd | Hannegan Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,500,000 | 8 | Low |
| 152 | Illinois Street | Valencia St | Woburn St | Bike Boulevard | \$5,000 | 8 | Low |
| 210 | Woburn Street | Old Lakeway Dr | Whatcom St | Bike Boulevard | \$7,000 | 8 | Low |
| 88 | Crestline Drive | Klipsun Trail | Silver Beach Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$31,000 | 8 | Low |
| 158 | Maryland Street | Michigan St | Yew St | Bike Boulevard | \$9,000 | 8 | Low |
| 125 | McLeod Road | Telegraph Rd | James St | Bike Boulevard | \$70,000 | 8 | Low |
| 121 | McLeod Road | Magrath Rd | Britton Rd | Bike Lane | \$140,000 | 8 | Low |
| 163 | Euclid Ave / Lakeside Ave / Decatur St / Flynn St | Lakeway Dr | Electric Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$95,000 | 8 | Low |
| 141 | Laurelwood Avenue | Cedarwood Ave | Cottonwood Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$21,000 | 8 | Low |
| 122 | Carrington Way | Barkley Blvd | Northridge Trail | Bike Boulevard | \$20,000 | 7 | Low |
| 167 | Consolidation Ave / Pacific View Dr | San Juan Blvd | Puget St | Bike Boulevard | \$19,000 | 7 | Low |
| 91 | Silver Beach Avenue | Lakeridge Ln | North Shore Dr | Bike Boulevard | \$27,000 | 7 | Low |
| 92 | Dakin Street | Silver Beach Ave | Alabama St | Bike Boulevard | \$14,000 | 7 | Low |
| 113 | Stuart Road | Guide Meridian Rd | Deemer Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,000,000 | 7 | Low |
| 181 | Woodside Way | Chandler Pkwy | Northridge Park Trail | Bike Boulevard | \$22,000 | 7 | Low |
| 157 | Superior Street | Illinois St | Railroad Trail entrance | Bike Boulevard | \$7,000 | 7 | Low |
| 109 | Tremont Avenue | Cordata Pkwy | Guide Meridian Rd | Bike Lane | \$2,100,000 | 7 | Low |
| 111 | Deemer Road | Horton Rd | Stuart Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$3,500,000 | 7 | Low |
| 127 | Greenwood Avenue | Cedarwood Ave | Cottonwood Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$27,000 | 7 | Low |
| 199 | W Horton Road | Aldrich Rd | Northwest Dr | Bike Lane | \$4,500,000 | 6 | Low |
| 116 | Prince Avenue | Guide Meridian Rd | Deemer Rd | Bike Lane | \$7,500,000 | 6 | Low |
| 183 | Redwood Avenue | Alderwood Ave | Hollywood Ave | Bike Boulevard | \$22,000 | 6 | Low |
| 215 | Meridian Street [e] | Horton Rd | (city border) | Separated Bike Lane | \$340,000 | 6 | Low |
| 218 | Yew Street | Lakeway Dr | Tacoma Ave | Bike Lane | \$4,600,000 | 6 | Low |
| 219 | Yew Street | Tacoma Ave | Samish Way | Separated Bike Lane | <i>Project beyond City boundary, not costed</i> | 6 | Low |
| 226 | 27th Street | Douglas Ave | Durbin Dr | Multi-Use Trail | \$210,000 | 6 | Low |
| 114 | Tull Road | Stuard Rd | Kellogg Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$3,000,000 | 6 | Low |
| 180 | 40th Street | Broad St | Samish Way | Bike Boulevard | \$11,000 | 5 | Low |
| 138 | Bellis Fair Mall Connection | Telegraph Rd | E Bellis Fair Pkwy | Separated Bike Lane | \$2,500,000 | 5 | Low |
| 80 | Kline Road | Cordata Pkwy | Meridian St | Separated Bike Lane | \$9,100,000 | 5 | Low |
| 115 | Van Wyck Park-Cordata Park Trail Connection | Cordata Pkwy | James St | Multi-Use Trail | \$1,300,000 | 4 | Low |
| 110 | E Horton Road | Guide Meridian Rd | Deemer Rd | Separated Bike Lane | \$610,000 | 4 | Low |
| 112 | Van Wyck Road | Deemer Rd | James St | Separated Bike Lane | \$1,100,000 | 3 | Low |
| 223 | Padden Creek | East side of I-5 | West side of I-5 | Further Study Needed | \$500,000 | 2 | Low |

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK



Bellingham Bicycle Master Plan

April 2024

