

Appendix **E**

Prioritization Methodology



Prioritization Methodology

This appendix provides details on the methodology for evaluating and prioritizing trail projects.

Scoring Methodology Overview

A total of seven criteria were identified to evaluate and prioritize trail projects. The first five criteria are considered trail benefits. The last two criteria are related to feasibility and practicality, including cost.

1. Safety and Low-Stress
2. Regional Connectivity and Key Destinations
3. Parallel Bikeways and Trails
4. Public Input
5. Facilitating Parks Access
6. Constructability/Complexity
7. Planning-Level Cost Estimates

The scoring for each criterion was either high, medium, or low, as explained in **Table E-1**.

Priority Tiers

Based on the total score the segments are sorted into three tiers of projects:

- **Tier 1 Trails:** Regional trail corridors actively under development are the top tier trail priorities. These trails were not evaluated, as they are already City priorities.
- **Tier 2 Trails:** Emerging priorities – priorities for City to implement within 5-10 years.
- **Tier 3 Trails:** Vision corridors – anticipated timeline of 10-30 years.

Table E-2 presents the evaluation results for existing trail improvements and new trails. Some segments of existing and proposed trails were evaluated separately to clarify their relative performance. The tables include both symbols reflecting the scores and numerical scores, as explained in the legend. The existing and proposed trails are listed in descending order of scores.





Alameda Creek Trail near Farmhouse Street

Table E-1. Detailed Scoring Methodology

High Score	Medium Score	Low Score
Criteria 1: Safety and Low-Stress		
Provides an alternative route to an on-street route with a high incidence of pedestrian and bicycle injuries or fatalities	Provides an alternative route to an on-street route with a medium level of collisions or public mentions for improvements	Provides an alternative route to an on-street route with a low level of collisions or no public comments for improvements
Criteria 2: Regional Connectivity and Key Destinations		
Connects to regional transit, Central Park, Fremont's Downtown, a Town Center (Centerville, Irvington, Warm Springs, Niles, Mission San Jose), or a major employment hub (Ardenwood, Pacific Commons, or Bayside Industrial)	Connects to major public facilities (library, schools, community park)	Other
Criteria 3: Parallel Bikeways and Trails		
Trail corridors with no major adjacent parallel bikeway system	Trail corridors with any segments that are adjacent to and parallel with other major trails or bicycle facilities	Trail corridors parallel to major existing or proposed bikeways or trails
Criteria 4: Public Input		
High number of supporting comments	Medium number of supporting comments	Low number of supporting comments
Criteria 5: Facilitating Parks Access		
<i>For the current Parks Master Plan effort one of the goals, endorsed by the Mayor, is that all residents of Fremont should be no more than a 10 minute walk from a City park.</i>		
The trail additions or improvements make it possible for a significant part of a neighborhood and/or a higher residential density neighborhood to access a City park with a 10 minute walk that is currently farther away. Or the trail additions or improvements provide recreational opportunities to a higher density residential community with no parks nearby.	The trail additions or improvements make it possible for a limited part of a neighborhood and/or a lower residential density neighborhood to access a City park with a 10 minute walk that is currently farther away. Or the trail additions or improvements provide recreational opportunities to a lower density residential community with no parks nearby.	Does not improve neighborhood access to a park
Criteria 6: Constructability/Complexity		
Fully in a City right-of-way that is generally flat with minimal barriers	Requires agency (ie. ACFC or SFPUC) permission, but has minimal barriers or slopes	Has major barriers, slopes, and/or requires right-of-way acquisition/permission – especially railroad or private properties
Criteria 7: Planning-Level Cost Estimates		
Relatively low cost per mile	Medium cost per mile	High cost per mile

Table E-2.
Evaluation of Existing Trail Corridor
Improvements and Proposed Trails

Legend:

-  Large Black Symbols = High Score (2)
-  Small Gray Symbols = Medium Score (1)
- No Symbol = Low Score (0)

Proposed Trail Corridor
Existing Trail Corridor

Corr. No.	Corridor Name	Evaluation Criteria														Total Score
		Safety and Low Stress		Regional Connectivity and Key Destinations		Parallel Bikeways and Trails		Public Input		Facilitating Parks Access		Construct. / Complexity		Planning-Level Cost Estimates		
		Symbol	Score	Symbol	Score	Symbol	Score	Symbol	Score	Symbol	Score	Symbol	Score	Symbol	Score	
10A	Proposed Hetch-Hetchy North-South Trail (680 to Milpitas)		1		2		1		2		2		1		1	10
6B	Proposed Mission Creek Trail Gap Closure (Palm to Mission)		2		1		0		1		1		2		2	9
1A	Alameda Creek Trail Enhancements (Ardenwood to Isherwood)		1		1		1		2		0		1		2	8
6A	Mission Creek Trail Enhancements (Central Park to Palm)		1		1		2		1		0		1		2	8
7	Sabercat Historical Park Trail Extension (I-680 Bridge) and Enhancements		2		1		2		1		0		1		1	8
19	Proposed Grimmer Greenway		2		2		1		0		0		1		2	8
9	Proposed Hetch-Hetchy East-West Trail		2		1		2		0		2		1		0	8
23	Proposed Pacific Commons Bicycle/Pedestrian Connection		2		2		2		1		1				0	8
24	Proposed Kato Road Trail		2		2		1		0		0		1		2	8
8	Proposed Fremont Blvd Channel Trail (ACFC Line Roberts to Cushing)		1		1		1		1		2		1		0	7
12	Richmond Ave Channel Trail (ACFC Line Stivers to 880)		2		2		0		0		2		1		0	7
14	Northgate Trail Enhancements		1		1		1		0		0		2		2	7
15A	Ardenwood Path Enhancements (Alameda Creek Trail to proposed Crandall Creek Trail)		1		1		1		0		0		2		2	7
20	Proposed Irvington Neighborhood Trail (ACFC Line Paseo Padre to Lee St.)		2		2		1		0		2				0	7
22	Proposed Warm Springs BART to Milpitas via the BART Corridor		2		1		1		1		1				1	7
1B	Alameda Creek Trail Enhancements (Isherwood to Niles Canyon) - recently repaved		1		1		1		1		0		1		1	6
13	Brookvale/Cabrillo/Patterson Park Trail Enhancements		0		1		1		1		0		2		1	6
17	Lowry Park Trail Enhancements		0		0		2		0		0		2		2	6
15B	Proposed Crandall Creek Trail (connects to existing Ardenwood Path)		1		1		1		1		0		1		1	6
18	Proposed U-Channel Trail		2		1		0		0		2		1		0	6
16	Farwell Pathway Enhancements		0		1		0		0		0		1		2	4
10B	Proposed Hetch-Hetchy North-South Trail (Mission to 680)		0		0		1		1		1		1		0	4
11	Proposed PG&E Corridor and Channel Trail		0		0		0		0		2				0	2