



Solano Transportation Authority

One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun City, California 94585

Area Code 707
424-6075 • Fax 424-6074

Members:

- Benicia
- Dixon
- Fairfield
- Rio Vista
- Solano County
- Suisun City
- Vacaville
- Vallejo

PAC

PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Thursday, June 15, 2006, 6:00 p.m.
STA Conference Room
One Harbor Center, Suite 130
Suisun, CA 94585

ITEM

COMMITTEE/ STAFF
PERSON

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>I. CALL TO ORDER- SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
(6:00-6:05 p.m.)</p> | <p>Eva Laevastu</p> |
| <p>II. APPROVAL OF APRIL 27, 2006 PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
(6:05-6:10 p.m.)-Pg 1</p> | <p>Sam Shelton</p> |
| <p>III. ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>A. Countywide Pedestrian Project Priority Methodology
<i>Recommendation: Support a methodology to begin prioritizing pedestrian projects.</i>
(6:10-7:10 p.m.)-Pg 6</p> | <p>Randy Anderson/
Robert Guerrero</p> |
| <p>B. Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program (SBPP) Update and Appointment of SBPP Review Subcommittee
<i>Recommendation:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Schedule next PAC meeting for July 20th to develop SBPP Tier 1 and Tier 2 project recommendations for FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09.</i> 2. <i>Appoint PAC members to a subcommittee to discuss improvements to the SBPP program.</i>
(7:10-7:15 p.m.)-Pg 14 | <p>Eva Leavastu</p> |
| <p>IV. INFORMATION ITEMS (7:15-7:30 p.m.) Pg- 16</p> <p>A. Safe Routes to School Program</p> <p>B. Remaining 2006 Schedule/Future Agenda Items</p> | <p>Sam Shelton
Robert Guerrero</p> |
| <p>V. ADJOURNMENT-Next scheduled PAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for July 20th, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.</p> | |



PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the meeting
April 27, 2006

I. CALL TO ORDER/SELF INTRODUCTIONS AND OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

The regular meeting of the Pedestrian Advisory Committee was called to order at approximately 6:00 p.m. in the Solano Transportation Authority’s Conference Room.

Present:

PAC Members Present:	Eva Laevastu, Chair	Tri City & Co. Co-op Planning Group
	Lynne Williams	Vallejo PAC member
	Pat Moran	Fairfield PAC member
	Larry Mork	Rio Vista PAC member
	J.B. Davis	Benicia PAC Member

Members not present:	Michael Segala	Suisun City PAC member
	Linda Williams	Solano County PAC Member
	Allen Deal	Member At Large
	Frank Morris	Solano Land Trust

Others Present:	Paul Wiese	Solano County
	Brian Miller	City of Fairfield
	Robert Guerrero	STA
	Sam Shelton	STA

II. APPROVAL OF APRIL 27, 2006 PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE AGENDA AND FEBRUARY 16, 2006 PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

With a motion by J.B. Davis and a second by Larry Mork, the PAC approved the April 27, 2006 PAC agenda and the February 16, 2006 PAC meeting minutes.

III. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Safe Routes to School

Sam Shelton gave an overview of the Safe Routes to School Study to the PAC. Mr. Shelton noted that PAC members will be asked to participate in the SR2S Study and will give the PAC more details about the SR2S process at their next PAC meeting.

B. PAC Membership

Eva Laevastu informed the PAC that two members, Mary Woo and Kathy Blume have resigned from the PAC bringing the active number of PAC members to eight.

Larry Mork stated that there were too many members on the PAC and that the PAC should consider the removal of some long-standing vacancies. Lynn Williams stated that a more diverse group of PAC members adds to the variety of opinion of the committee.

Eva Laevastu asked that the topic of PAC membership be discussed at a later PAC meeting.

SR12/Jameson Canyon Truck Climbing Lane Status

Although not on the agenda, Eva Laevastu asked about the status of the truck climbing lane project along the north side of SR12 between I-80 and Jameson Canyon. Robert Guerrero stated that a Caltrans representative will be invited to a later BAC meeting to discuss the project and answer questions.

J.B. Davis commented on Caltran's disregard for applying DD-64 to this project. Mr. Davis further noted that the Solano Countywide Bicycle Plan calls for a Class I or II bicycle facility along this route while the Caltrans PSR states that they recognize this as a Class III route.

IV. Action Items

A. Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (SBPP) Tier 1 and Tier 2 Priority Lists

Sam Shelton described the Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (SBPP) scoring process, statistical summary of scores, and the Tier 1 (T1) and Tier 2 (T2) priority list examples. Mr. Shelton then asked the PAC to review the materials and make a recommendation for a Tier 1 and Tier 2 PAC Priority List of projects.

Eva Laevastu asked the PAC if they considered Suisun City's Marina Blvd sidewalk project as either T1 or T2. Ms. Laevastu stated that she did not believe that a sidewalk project for one side of a street represented a gap closure. J.B. Davis noted that the new sidewalk along the east side is needed to establish a connection between the SR12/Marina Blvd intersection crosswalk on east side.

Eva Laevastu asked the PAC to consider Fairfield's Union Avenue project. Ms. Laevastu considered the project to not be a gap closure project since there are existing facilities. Lynn Williams stated that the project closes a perceived gap and makes the connection between downtown Fairfield and downtown Suisun City more intuitive. J.B. Davis stated that the intuitive route is to walk across the tracks, representing a large safety issue. Pat Moran noted that this project will work well with other redevelopment projects planned for the surrounding area.

J.B. Davis stated that he scored Vallejo's Downtown Vallejo Station Bike and Ped connections project high due to its Transportation for Livable Communities (TLC) qualities, while the rest of the PAC gave the project lower scores. Eva Laevastu stated that she scored this project low. Ms. Laevastu stated that she agrees with its TLC qualities but has scored the project according to the SBPP guidelines and criteria.

J.B. Davis asked the PAC to address Fairfield's McGary Road Project's high PAC

scores. Mr. Davis expressed his confusion about how the PAC see this project as scoring high on “Access”. Lynn Williams stated that this project provides access for recreational purposes. Larry Mork agreed with Ms. Williams, stating that he would like to walk down McGary Road for exercise. J.B. Davis noted that as a BAC member, he believes this project is perfect for bicycle commuters, but not for pedestrian access to commuter destinations such as transit access or grocery store access. J.B. Davis was in favor of the idea of pooling SBPP bicycle and pedestrian shares of funds together to fund this very important bicycle project; however, he continued to stress that the PAC should fund projects that increase pedestrian access to destinations that help remove cars from the road.

J.B. Davis asked the PAC to consider Vacaville’s Nob Hill Bike Path Project. Mr. Davis thought that this project greatly enhances access to destinations in the area.

Pat Moran stated that she thought that Vallejo’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Project was a good project but the SBPP criteria does not account for its good qualities. J.B. Davis stated that he thought that the need for bike lockers should equate to closing a gap for bicycles on route to transit.

J.B. asked the PAC to consider Fairfield’s West Texas Street Gateway Project. Mr. Davis explained to the PAC that the BAC has a strict policy of not funding ‘art’. Mr. Davis also stated that the project would create a hazard for bicycles if the sidewalk and curb extensions narrowed the street width. Eva Laevastu stated that the project should accommodate both bicycles and pedestrians. Brian Miller understood their concerns regarding art and bicycle access. Mr. Miller explained that the roadway would be narrowed due to the installation of sidewalks; however, he has not reviewed the final design of the project. Mr. Miller clarified that Fairfield would not use STA dollars for the installation of art. Mr. Miller explained that a number of funding sources are required to build matching funds to make this project happen.

Eva Laevastu asked STA staff if it was possible to add other projects to the list later. Robert Guerrero answered that it was possible.

J.B. Davis made a motion for the following projects to be on the PAC’s T1 and T2 list according to the SBPP guidelines which call for a ‘natural break’ between T1 and T2 lists:

Tier 1: West Texas Street Gateway Project, McGary Road, Nob Hill, Linear Park (Dover to Claybank).

Tier 2: Remaining projects from staff recommended list.

J.B. Davis noted that his recommendation makes Fairfield’s Union Avenue Project a T2 project, which would only be eligible for 25% of SBPP funds that fiscal year. Mr. Davis asked Brian Miller how much could Fairfield complete with only \$25,000 for the Union Avenue Corridor project. Brian Miller stated that Fairfield would only be able to complete a couple of project parts and that Fairfield would need to find other funding sources.

J.B. also recommended that only T1 projects be funded; therefore, carrying over funds each year to fund only T1 projects. Larry Mork stated that carrying over funds risks losing them. J.B. Davis stated that carryover funds would help fund priority projects. Pat Moran agreed with Mr. Davis, stating that she was in favor of funding substantial projects instead of funding piecemeal parts of the PAC's vision.

Pat Moran stated that McGary Road does not make sense to have as a pedestrian priority project. Lynn Williams took Ms. Moran's point further by recommending to take McGary Road and Nob Hill Bike Path off the T1 list. J.B. Davis disagreed with Ms. Williams stating that Nob Hill Bike Path benefits both bicycles and pedestrians. Eva Laevastu did not agree with removing McGary Road from the PAC's priority projects list. Ms. Laevastu explained that McGary Road is an important part of the Bay Ridge Trail.

J.B. Davis recommended moving Vallejo Station Bike and Ped Links project onto the T1 list. Lynn Williams recommended moving Vallejo Station Bike and Ped Links above McGary Road.

J.B. Davis recommended that Old Town Cordelia project should be moved onto the T1 list since it offers a safe route to Rodriguez School.

Pat Moran made a motion for the PAC to adopt the following T1 and T2 priority lists:

Tier 1: West Texas Gateway Project, Vallejo Station Bicycle and Pedestrian Links, Old Town Cordelia, Nob Hill Bike Path, McGary Road, Linear Park.

Tier 2: Remaining projects from staff recommended list.

J.B. Davis seconded Ms. Moran's motion and the PAC unanimously adopted the T1 and T2 Priority lists for the PAC

Pat Moran noted that this discussion was very helpful in understanding the projects and priorities of the PAC.

Robert Guerrero asked the PAC to make a funding recommendation for FY 06/07 SBPP Projects using their T1 and T2 priority lists.

The PAC continued the debate regarding carrying over TDA-Article 3 dollars for T1 projects or distributing all of the funds each fiscal year. The PAC chose to attempt to fund two T1 projects requesting funds in later years (Fairfield's McGary Road and West Texas Street Gateway Projects) with current year funds.

Larry Mork made the following FY 2006/07 PAC funding motion: \$25,000 for Fairfield's Union Avenue Corridor project, \$50,000 for Fairfield's West Texas Project, and \$25,000 for Fairfield's McGary Road project. J.B. Davis seconded the motion and the PAC unanimously approved the FY2006/07 funding recommendation.

B. MTC's Routine Accommodations for Non-Motorized Travelers Policy

Robert Guerrero summarized the latest MTC Routine Accommodations draft to the PAC and asked them to support it if the policy did not condition funding. J.B. Davis made a motion that the PAC recommend MTC's Routing Accommodations policy as is. Larry Mork seconded Mr. Davis' motion.

J.B. Davis explained that bicycle advocates have already made concessions that weaken the policy in favor of not building bicycle and pedestrian facilities on a routine basis.

The PAC unanimously adopted Mr. Davis' motion to recommend the routine accommodations as shown in the current draft.

C. Pedestrian Advisory Committee Priority Pedestrian Projects

Robert Guerrero asked the PAC to forward a recommendation to the STA Board to update the Solano Countywide Pedestrian Priority Plan Priority Pedestrian Projects. On a motion by Pat Moran and a second from Lynn Williams, the PAC adopted the recommendation.

V. **Adjournment**

The PAC meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.



DATE: June 8, 2006
TO: Solano Pedestrian Advisory Committee
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Associate Planner
Re: Countywide Pedestrian Project Priority Methodology

Background:

The Solano Countywide Pedestrian Plan was developed through the efforts and guidance of the Solano Transportation Authority (STA), Landpeople (consultants for the countywide plan), and the Solano Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC). The Countywide Pedestrian Plan was approved and recommended by the PAC in September 2004 followed by STA Board adoption in October 2004. The plan is the first effort to identify countywide significant pedestrian projects in the Bay Area. The Solano Transportation Authority (STA) was given an award by the Northern California Chapter of the American Planning Association for the development and implementation of this Pedestrian Plan.

The Plan identified several pedestrian projects in three specific categories: current projects, conceptual projects and priority projects. Each city and the County of Solano have identified at least one priority project included in the plan, as indicated in the following matrix:

Agency	Project
Benicia	State Park Road/I-780 Overcrossing
Dixon	Multi-modal Transportation Center
Rio Vista	Waterfront Plan and Improvement Project
Fairfield	West Texas Street Urban Village Project
Suisun City	Driftwood Drive Pedestrian Project
Vacaville	Vacaville Creek Walk Extension to McClellan Street
Vallejo	Vallejo Ferry Station Pedestrian and Streetscape Enhancements

Multi-Jurisdictional (Fairfield, Suisun, and Solano County)	Union Ave (Fairfield) to Main Street (Suisun City) Enhancements Program
Multi-Jurisdiction (Fairfield, Suisun, Solano County, and Vacaville)	Jepson Parkway

Discussion:

Landpeople has developed a draft criteria for the PAC to consider and provide input (see Attachment A). The majority of the meeting is dedicated to discussing the draft methodology with the hope of coming to a consensus as to what the final methodology would be. Attachment B is the schedule for prioritizing the projects. The goal is to have the PAC recommend a list of prioritized projects in August 2006 in order to have the STA Board approve the list by September. A September approval by the STA Board will ensure that the pedestrian projects identified will be ready in time for the next Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program cycle.

STA staff is also working to provide an overall status update on the projects currently listed in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan. The PAC will be presented an update on the projects and a PowerPoint by Landpeople discussing what makes a pedestrian project.

Recommendation:

Review, comment, and recommend a criteria for prioritizing pedestrian projects to include in the Countywide Pedestrian Plan update.

- Attachment: A. Draft Criteria for Prioritizing Pedestrian Projects
 B. Pedestrian Project Update Schedule

ATTACHMENT A

Draft List – Criteria for Prioritizing Pedestrian Projects

Solano Transportation Authority
Pedestrian Advisory Committee

The Countywide Pedestrian Plan's Overall Goal is:

A complete, safe, and enjoyable system of pedestrian routes and zones in places people need and want to go in Solano County, providing a viable alternative to the use of the automobile, through connection to transit, and employment, health, commercial, recreational and social centers.

STA and its Pedestrian Advisory Committee can help achieve this goal by providing funds targeted to the most beneficial pedestrian-oriented projects, This will encourage new pedestrian improvement project applications that would otherwise not be developed, and to fund beneficial projects that cannot otherwise be funded.

A potential objective of the project criteria list and screening process is to separate out projects that include elements of pedestrian access, but are primarily focused on purposes for which there are other targeted funding programs, e.g. Safe Routes to School, Transportation Livable Communities (TLC), Bicycle Transportation Account.

If pedestrian-specific funding is sought for a project with broader purposes, the criteria will help the project sponsor to identify specific pedestrian benefits and features as a separately funded enhancement or addition.

The current Countywide Pedestrian Plan contains planning and design guidelines in Section 5 that provide a basis for criteria for pedestrian-beneficial projects. The draft criteria outlined below have been summarized from these guidelines.

Connections to Transit

1. The project connects to local bus stop(s);
2. Connects to express/regional bus stop(s);
3. Provides amenities for waiting transit riders (benches, lighting, shelter, landscaping, news racks);
4. Connects to regional multi-modal transit hub (bus, carpool, train, ferry).

Overcoming Barriers

The project provides pedestrian access across a previously impassible or unsafe barrier (Project benefit/score should be increased based on distance from an alternative crossing)

1. Freeways/expressways
2. Railroad(s)
3. Arterial roads (4 lanes or greater, 35 mph or greater)
4. Waterways

Creating Walkable Communities

1. The project is part of and consistent with an adopted General Plan circulation element or Pedestrian Master Plan that addresses pedestrian circulation in the City or subarea.
2. The project closes a gap in an adopted regional trail system such as the San Francisco Bay Trail or the Bay Area Ridge Trail.
3. The project is part of an existing or planned mixed use district with housing, shopping, employment, and basic public facilities within ¼ to ½ mile of each other.
4. The project serves residential densities higher than 12 dwelling units per acre
5. The project serves residential densities higher than 24 dwelling units per acre
6. There is a range of densities and land uses within ¼ mile of the project site.
7. The projects provides or improves connection to transit.
8. The project provides access to a site or facility with a demonstrated high use or potential use (park, public building complex, hospital, senior or youth center, major shopping center or downtown commercial district, etc. The higher the quantified population density/total, the higher the score).

Pedestrian-Friendly Site Planning and Design

1. The maximum building footprint in the area served by the project is approximately 30,000 s.f., or 50,000 s.f. for supermarkets.
2. Buildings are sited along and oriented to the street and adjacent sidewalk, rather than parking located between the street/sidewalk and the buildings.
3. The project has an architectural, landscape, and/or sign graphic theme that expresses local identity.
4. The project provides pedestrian amenities:
 - ADA access improvements (all new projects must be fully compliant)
 - A minimum 6 foot pathway or sidewalk width

- Special decorative paving types
- Site furniture
- Landscaping, particularly trees and plantings to separate pedestrians from traffic
- Pedestrian-level lighting
- Space for activities and socializing

Street System Design

If associated with a project including design of new streets, or re-design of existing streets:

1. Streets are in an interconnected grid system with a maximum block length of approximately 330 to 440 feet.
2. If longer blocks are planned or exist, pedestrian connections are provided every 250 to 300 feet.
3. Driveways are consolidated whenever possible, or located on less busy cross streets or alleys.
4. Traffic lanes are relatively narrow (10' to 11') while sidewalks are relatively wide
5. On-street parking is allowed to help buffer pedestrians from traffic.
6. Parking is restricted near crosswalks to avoid obstructing the line of sight of pedestrians and drivers.
7. Speed limits are reduced to no more than 25 mph, and as low as 10 or 15 mph in pedestrian-oriented areas.

Street Crossings

1. The duration of signal intervals is long enough to allow the average pedestrian to complete a street crossing in one cycle (approximately __ seconds, minimum).
2. Pedestrian/bicyclist activated signals are provided.
3. "Count down" signals are provided, giving the time before the signal will turn red.
4. Crossings of wider streets incorporate median or refuge islands, and bulb-outs of the curb and sidewalk to reduce the crossing distance.
5. Pedestrian activated crossing warning lights are provided in locations where the number of pedestrians does not warrant a permanent traffic signal and existing traffic

signals are spaced far apart. Such lights can be located overhead or embedded in the road surface.

6. Right turns on red lights are prohibited in busy pedestrian areas.
7. Special crosswalk paving/marketing materials, colors and/or textures
8. Landscaped median and/or planter strips are provided, typically incorporating decorative paving
9. Smaller street corner radii are used to reduce the crossing distance for pedestrians and constrain automobile speeds.
10. Signs are placed in medians or street centers warning drivers of upcoming crosswalks and to stop for pedestrians.

Criteria Scoring Concepts

A sample scoring sheet is attached that illustrates how projects could be scored against these criteria:

1. Each project should be scored against each criterion within the points range based on how completely it fulfills the objective. Some criteria have a higher range than others because they potentially have a more significant benefit.
2. The process of scoring is unavoidably subjective. It would be best to average scores done individually by a few committee and/or staff members, or do as a group and try to keep some continuity in the makeup of the group from year to year.
3. If an objective of the pedestrian project funding program is to avoid funding project that may be better suited to other funding programs, there are various alternatives for accomplishing this:
 - a. Project applications could be scored against at least the basic criteria of programs such as:
 - Safe Routes to School
 - TLC
 - Bicycle Transportation Account
 - b. Projects that would score highly under those programs could have their scores reduced (or be eliminated from consideration?) for the Pedestrian Project funds.

- c. Alternatively, it could be a condition of the Program that a project cannot receive Pedestrian Program funds if it has received funding from these other programs.
 - d. Or, it could be left up to the Pedestrian Advisory Committee to determine on a case-by-case basis whether they wanted to combine the Program funding with that from another program.
4. Finally, to factor the score between larger, more complex and expensive projects and smaller projects, the overall score should be divided by the amount of the grant request. This would tend to favor agencies that are able to provide a significant portion of the project cost.

ATTACHMENT B

Pedestrian Project Update Schedule:

June 15th - PAC meeting

- Present a draft methodology for PAC to discuss and provide input (Consultant).
- Present status report on current projects (STA staff).

June 28th - TAC meeting

- STA staff provides an overview of the update process and makes a request for new and/or revised pedestrian projects to be included in the updated plan (STA staff).

July 28th

- Project Sponsors submit new and/or revised project submittals to STA staff.

July 28th to August 8th

- Apply draft methodology to current and new project submittals (Consultant).

August 17th - PAC meeting

- Present findings and new projects list (Consultant).
- Recommend list for approval to STA Board (STA staff).

August 17th -

- Submit Draft methodology report (Consultant).

August 30th - TAC meeting

- Present draft methodology report to TAC and recommend list for approval by STA Board based on PAC recommendation (STA Staff).

September 1st -

- Submit Final methodology report due based on TAC input (Consultant).

September 13th - STA Board

- Approve new and/or revised pedestrian projects list to be included in Countywide Pedestrian Plan Update (STA staff).

Completion Date: Tentative STA Board approval of update is September 13th, 2006.



DATE: June 12, 2006
TO: Solano Pedestrian Advisory Committee
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Associate Planner
Re: Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program (SBPP) Update and Appointment of SBPP Review Subcommittee

Background:

The Solano Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) and the Solano Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC) spent several months last year developing the Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program (SBPP) to update the overall funding recommendation process for Solano County pedestrian and bicycle projects. Based on the unanimous recommendations by PAC and the BAC, the Solano Transportation Authority (STA) Board of Directors approved the SBPP on December 14, 2005. The SBPP is a list of Tier 1 and Tier 2 pedestrian and bicycle projects with recommended funding over three fiscal years. Funding associated with the SBPP program includes: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3, Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (E.CMAQ) funds, and Solano County's share of the Bay Area Bicycle/Pedestrian Program funds.

The PAC and BAC for the first time administered the SBPP program earlier this year as specified by the adopted SBPP Guidelines and Criteria. Applications for the three-year Tier 1 and Tier 2 list were reviewed and evaluated prior to discussions and recommendations in separate PAC and BAC meetings held in April 2006. The PAC and BAC reached consensus for funding and prioritizing Year 1 projects and proposed to continue discussions for prioritizing Year Two (2007-08) and Year Three (2008-09) Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects at a later meeting.

Discussion:

The BAC is scheduled to complete their discussions on prioritizing Year Two and Year Three Tier 1 and Tier 2 projects on Thursday, July 6, 2006. Staff would like to hold a special PAC meeting in July dedicated solely to completing the PAC's priority list of projects for Year Two and Three as well in order to complete the process and have the STA Board consider a recommendation by both committees.

Furthermore, a suggestion was made by the PAC chair, Eva Leavastu, to establish a subcommittee of the PAC to discuss the overall SBPP process including positive and negative aspects of the program in an effort to improve it for the next cycle. The subcommittee is proposed to have three PAC members and three members of the BAC that will meet to exchange ideas for the full PAC committee to consider prior to the August 18th meeting. The BAC will also have an opportunity to consider the subcommittee's

recommendation around the same time frame (a BAC meeting date remains unconfirmed at this time).

Recommendation:

1. Schedule the next PAC meeting for July 20th to develop SBPP Tier 1 and Tier 2 project recommendations for FY 2007-08 and FY 2008-09.
2. Appoint PAC members to a subcommittee to discuss improvements to the SBPP program.



DATE: June 12, 2006
TO: Solano Pedestrian Advisory Committee
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Associate Planner
Re: Informational Items

A. **Safe Routes to School Program-** (Sam Shelton, STA)

The STA's Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program is intended to improve and enhance the safety of pedestrian and bicycle modes of student travel, by enhancing related infrastructure and programs, to provide safe passage to schools. Although this program is related to the pedestrian planning efforts of the PAC, the SR2S program is a separate program being developed to specifically focus on pedestrian and bicycle facilities near and around schools throughout Solano County. Eva Laevastu is the current representative from the PAC and will provide a brief status of SR2S Program. Several introductory presentations have been made to city councils and school boards and a countywide steering committee has recommended goals and objectives for the SR2S Program. The PAC is expected to have a more detailed presentation on the SR2S effort later in the fall after the SR2S Program is developed further.

B. **Remaining 2006 Schedule/Future Agenda Items-** (Robert Guerrero, STA)

Excluding any special meetings, the PAC is anticipated to have at least three more meetings in 2006. Using the established third Thursday of every other month for PAC meetings the remaining schedule is proposed as follows:

- July 20, 2006 (special)
- August 17, 2006
- October 19, 2006
- December 21, 2006

As discussed in a previous agenda item, the PAC is requested to have a special meeting in July dedicated to discussing the SBPP Program only. In August and October the PAC is expected to primarily discuss the Countywide Pedestrian Plan Projects update. It is also apparent that the December PAC meeting may need to be re-scheduled since it is close to the Christmas holiday. The PAC will be encouraged to provide input on the meeting schedule and possible agenda items for these meetings.