



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, August 10, 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 JUNE 15, 2006 PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
(6:05-6:10 p.m.)-Pg 1</p> | <p>Robert Guerrero</p> |
| <p>III. ACTION ITEMS</p> <p>A. Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (SBPP) FY 2007/08 and FY 2008/09 Funding Recommendations
<u>Recommendation:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Amend the Bicycle Advisory Committee's Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program's (SBPP) Tier 1 and Tier 2 Priority Lists to include the City of Benicia's State Park Road Project.</i> 2. <i>Recommend that the STA Board adopt Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (SBPP) FY 2007/08 and FY 2008/09 bicycle project funding recommendations. Pg 4 (6:10-7:15 p.m.)</i> | <p>Robert Guerrero</p> |
| <p>IV. INFORMATION ITEMS (7:15-7:30 p.m.) Pg 7</p> <p>A. Pedestrian Safety Training Courses</p> <p>B. Future Agenda Items</p> | <p>Robert Guerrero</p> <p>Eva Laevastu</p> |
| <p>V. ADJOURNMENT-Next scheduled PAC meeting is tentatively scheduled for September 21th, 2006 at 6:00 p.m.</p> | |



PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Minutes of the meeting
June 15, 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
	Larry Mork	Rio Vista PAC member
	Frank Morris	Solano Land Trust
	Allen Deal	Member At Large
	Linda Williams	Solano County PAC Member

Members not present:

Michael Segala	Suisun City PAC member
Pat Moran	Fairfield PAC member
Lynne Williams	Vallejo PAC member
J.B. Davis	Benicia PAC Member

Others Present:

Paul Wiese	Solano County
Randy Anderson	LandPeople
Kathleen Van Velsor	Association of Bay Area Governments
Robert Guerrero	STA
Sam Shelton	STA

The Pedestrian Advisory Committee did not have a quorum at 6:00pm and decided to proceed to Agenda Item III. A, Countywide Pedestrian Project Priority Methodology, but would not act on the item until a quorum was present. A quorum was present upon arrival of Linda Williams at 6:15 p.m. and the minutes from the April 27th meeting was accepted by general consensus.

III. ACTION ITEMS

A. Countywide Pedestrian Project Priority Methodology

Randy Anderson presented draft pedestrian project criteria for the prioritization of pedestrian projects in the Solano Countywide Pedestrian Plan.

Larry Mork expressed concerns that the goals of Mr. Anderson’s criteria were to attempt to fully fund projects. Mr. Mork believed that the PAC should attempt to provide matching funds for projects not fully fund projects.

Eva Laevastu asked staff for clarification between the Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian

Program's (SBPP) criteria, the Air District's Clean Air Funds criteria, and this draft set of criteria. Robert Guerrero explained that this set of criteria is meant to prioritize the 30 years of pedestrian projects found in the Solano Countywide Pedestrian Plan.

Frank Morris was satisfied with the "multiple benefit" criteria and the link it creates between other projects. Eva Laevastu asked the PAC to review the draft list of project criteria regardless of the funding aspects and only as they are important for pedestrians.

Paul Wiese asked how recreational trails fit into the criteria. Robert Guerrero explained the evolution of the Solano Countywide Pedestrian Plan from the initial effort to create a trails plan to the current plan that focuses less on recreation and more on connections to trails, transit, and more walkable communities. Mr. Wiese explained that most of the draft criteria is biased towards funding urban projects and will exclude rural projects. Kathleen Velsor asked Mr. Wiese to describe the pedestrian needs of Solano County. Mr. Wiese stated that there are a few projects in Solano County that are the exception to the rural profile such as Old Town Cordelia and Home Acres; however, there are areas of Solano County that would benefit from a community trail connecting homes such as in the English Hills area.

Frank Morris stated that the "Healthy Community" criteria would contain most Mr. Wiese's concerns. Mr. Wiese stated that those projects might score well on one set of criteria and low on the rest. Randy Anderson stated that one option might be to set aside funding for rural projects. Mr. Wiese compared this idea to that of the recently adopted Transit Funding Agreement which set aside a percentage for county funding.

Sam Shelton reminded the PAC that the criteria for the Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program was based on the goals and objectives found in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans, adopted by the STA Board.

Allan Deal made the point that this process will be subjective despite any criteria that the committee may recommend for adoption.

There was consensus among the PAC to table this item until the September PAC meeting for further review. Robert Guerrero asked the PAC to send him feedback by email to revise the draft criteria.

Kathleen Velsor made an announcement that the California Infrastructure Bonds will probably benefit projects that have multiple benefits and multiple jurisdiction cooperation.

B. Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program (SBPP) Update and Appointment of SBPP Review Subcommittee

Robert Guerrero asked that the PAC nominate two or three PAC members to serve on a subcommittee of BAC and PAC members to revise the Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program's (SBPP) process. Larry Mork and Eva Laevastu were appointed by group consensus.

IV. INFORMATION ITEMS

A. Safe Routes to School Program

Sam Shelton gave a brief overview of the current Safe Routes to School (SR2S) Program and how PAC members will be involved in the process of helping each of their communities choose priority (SR2S) projects and programs.

B. Remaining 2006 Schedule/Future Agenda Items

Robert Guerrero listed the remaining PAC tasks for the rest of the PAC meetings in 2006.

V. Adjournment

The PAC meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.



DATE: August 3, 2006
 TO: STA PAC
 FROM: Robert Guerrero, Senior Planner
 RE: Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (SBPP) FY 2007/08 and FY 2008/09 Funding Recommendations

Background:

The Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program (SBPP) helps to fund priority bicycle and pedestrian projects in countywide. The SBPP funds bicycle and pedestrian projects through three funding sources: Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article-3 funds, Countywide Bicycle and Pedestrian funds through Metropolitan Transportation Commission's (MTC) Regional Bicycle and Pedestrian Program, and Eastern Solano Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds.

On April 27, 2006, the PAC adopted the following Tier 1 and Tier 2 SBPP bicycle priority lists:

Tier	Sponsor	Project	Average PAC Score
1.1	Fairfield	West Texas Street Gateway Project, Phase I & II	37.4
1.2	Vallejo	Vallejo Station Pedestrian & Bicycle Links	31.6
1.3	Fairfield	McGary Road Regional Bike Path	36.6
1.4	Vacaville	Nob Hill Bike Path	33.0
1.5	Fairfield	Linear Park (Dover Ave to Claybank Rd)	32.9
1.6	Solano County	Old Town Cordelia Improvements	31.1
2.1	Suisun City	McCoy Creek Trail, Phase II	31.0
2.2	Suisun City	Marina Blvd. Sidewalk Gap Closure	30.7
2.3	Fairfield	Union Avenue Corridor, Phase II	30.6
2.4	Vacaville	Ulatis Creek Bike Path (Ulatis to Leisure Town)	29.1
2.5	Vacaville	Ulatis Creek Bike Path (Allison to I-80)	28.3

The PAC then recommended FY 2006-07 TDA SBPP funding for the following projects:

- \$25,000 for Fairfield’s Union Avenue Corridor, Phase II
- \$50,000 for Fairfield’s West Texas Street Gateway Project, Phase I & II
- \$25,000 for Fairfield’s McGary Road Regional Bike Path

Discussion:

Using the adopted Tier 1 and Tier 2 lists, the PAC is asked to make funding recommendations for the second and third years of the SBPP's 3-year implementation plan. Before the PAC makes a recommendation for funding, STA Staff requests that the PAC consider Benicia's State Park Road application to insert the project into the Tier 1 and Tier 2 Priority Project lists. Attached is a SBPP funding recommendation worksheet which has a STA staff recommended priority for Benicia's project and funding recommendations for the second and third year of the SBPP's 3-year implementation plan.

Recommendation:

1. Amend the Pedestrian Advisory Committee's Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program's (SBPP) Tier 1 and Tier 2 Priority Lists to include the City of Benicia's State Park Road Project.
2. Recommend that the STA Board adopt Solano Bicycle and Pedestrian Program (SBPP) FY 2007/08 and FY 2008/09 bicycle project funding recommendations.

Attachments:

- A. SBPP PAC Funding Recommendation worksheet.

SBPP Funding Recommendation Worksheet

Mode Application	Avg Score	Priority	Sponsor	Project	Pedestrian Funding Available (1/3 SBPP)							
					Request	TDA	MTC	ECMAQ	PAC	T2 25%	BAC	SBPP
FY 2006/07					\$560,000	\$100,000			\$100,000.00	\$25,000.00	\$201,333	\$301,333.33
Ped	40.30	2.3	Fairfield	Union Avenue Corridor, Phase II	\$100,000	\$25,000			\$25,000.00			\$25,000.00
Bike	32.20		Solano County	Vacaville-Dixon Bikeway, Phase I	\$300,000				\$0.00		\$151,333.33	\$151,333.33
Bike	30.80		Suisun City	Bike Lane Striping Along Railroad Ave, Phase I	\$60,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Bike	28.70		Solano County	Abernathy Road Bridge	\$100,000				\$0.00		\$50,000.00	\$50,000.00
Ped	37.40	1.1	Fairfield	West Texas Street Gateway Project, Phase I & II	\$50,000	\$50,000			\$50,000.00			\$50,000.00
Both	36.60	1.5	Fairfield	McGary Road Regional Bike Path	\$25,000	\$25,000			\$25,000.00			\$25,000.00
Remaining					\$0	\$0	\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00
FY 2007/08					\$3,435,000	\$106,333	\$232,667	\$271,333.33	\$610,333.33	\$152,583	\$1,220,667	\$1,831,000.00
Both			Benicia	State Park Road Bridge Project	\$800,000	\$106,333	\$160,333		\$266,666.67		\$393,000.00	\$659,666.67
Ped	37.40	1.1	Fairfield	West Texas Street Gateway Project, Phase I & II	\$250,000		\$72,333		\$72,333.33			\$72,333.33
Both	33.00	1.4	Vacaville	Nob Hill Bike Path	\$300,000			\$100,000.00	\$100,000.00		\$200,000.00	\$300,000.00
Bike	36.60	1.5	Fairfield	McGary Road Regional Bike Path	\$175,000				\$0.00		\$175,000.00	\$175,000.00
Ped	32.90	1.6	Fairfield	Linear Park (Dover Ave to Claybank Rd)	\$400,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Ped	30.70	2.2	Suisun City	Marina Blvd Sidewalk Gap Closure	\$110,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Both	29.10	2.4	Vacaville	Ulatis Creek Bike Path (Ulatis to Leisure Town)	\$1,000,000			\$171,333.33	\$171,333.33			\$171,333.33
Bike	24.60		Solano County	Vacaville-Dixon Bikeway, Phase II	\$1,000,000				\$0.00		\$342,666.67	\$342,666.67
Bike	24.30		Suisun City	Bike Lane Striping Along Railroad Ave, Phase II	\$90,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Bike	22.60		Solano County	Suisun Valley Road Bridge	\$110,000				\$0.00		\$110,000.00	\$110,000.00
Remaining					\$0	\$0	\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00
FY 2008/09					\$4,700,000	\$112,333	\$232,667	\$168,666.67	\$513,666.67	\$128,417	\$1,027,333	\$1,541,000.00
Both			Benicia	State Park Road Bridge Project	\$1,000,000	\$112,333	\$221,000		\$333,333.33		\$40,000.00	\$373,333.33
Ped	37.40	1.1	Fairfield	West Texas Street Gateway Project, Phase I & II	\$300,000		\$11,667		\$11,666.66			\$11,666.66
Both	32.00	1.2	Vallejo	Vallejo Station Pedestrian & Bicycle Links	\$800,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Both	31.50	1.3	Solano County	Old Town Cordelia Improvements	\$500,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Bike	36.60	1.5	Fairfield	McGary Road Regional Bike Path	\$650,000				\$0.00		\$650,000.00	\$650,000.00
Ped	32.90	1.6	Fairfield	Linear Park (Dover Ave to Claybank Rd)	\$50,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Both	31.00	2.1	Suisun City	McCoy Creek Trail, Phase II	\$200,000				\$0.00			\$0.00
Both	28.30	2.4	Vacaville	Ulatis Creek Bike Path (Allison to I-80)	\$1,200,000			\$168,666.67	\$168,666.67			\$168,666.67
Bike	23.30		Solano County	Vacaville-Dixon Bikeway, Phase III	\$1,000,000				\$0.00		\$337,333.33	\$337,333.33
Remaining					\$0	\$0	\$0.00		\$0.00		\$0.00	\$0.00



DATE: August 3, 2006
TO: Solano Pedestrian Advisory Committee
FROM: Robert Guerrero, Senior Planner
RE: Information Items

A. Pedestrian Safety Course- (Robert Guerrero, STA)

As part of the California Transportation Safety Plan Caltrans is offering a two two-day courses for the Bay Area to discuss ways to develop a safety action plan that will change the way the agency approaches pedestrian safety, or train their engineers and designers to provide pedestrian safety in their roadway design, or both. The Solano Transportation Authority is coordinating with Caltrans to host one of the two day courses in Fairfield for the northern Bay Area Counties (i.e. Solano County, Napa and Sonoma). Attached is a brief outline of possible discussion topics for the potential two-day course (see Attachment IV.A).

B. Future Agenda Items- (Eva Laevastu, PAC Chairperson)

The Pedestrian Advisory Committee (PAC) has two primary tasks to complete before the year's end: Updating the Countywide Pedestrian Plan and providing input on revisions to the Solano Bicycle Pedestrian Program (SBPP). As we begin to enter the second half of the year the PAC should consider other potential topics for the remaining 2006 PAC meetings. The remaining regularly scheduled meetings (3rd Thursday of every other month) for 2006 are: September 21st and November 16th. The PAC may want to consider possibly meeting either in October or December as well.

Technical Assistance and Related Training for FHWA Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Project

Provided by the UNC Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center and Project Consultants

Background and purpose: the FHWA Pedestrian Safety Action Plan Project has produced a “How-to-Guide” that explains the steps that an agency needs to take to reduce pedestrian crashes. These training options describe the types of services the consultant team can offer to help the agency develop a safety action plan that will change the way the agency approaches pedestrian safety, or train their engineers and designers to provide pedestrian safety in their roadway design, or both.

The Options

Option 1A: Developing a State or Local Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (1-Day Course)

Instructors walk attendees through the content of the how-to-guide, with interactive discussions on how to enact changes in agency policies and procedures.

Option 1B: Developing a State or Local Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (2-Day Course)

Instructors and attendees visit one or more sites where pedestrian crashes have occurred. Instructors and attendees walk through the content of the how-to-guide, with the goal of creating a draft Pedestrian Safety Action Plan to ensure changes in agency policies and procedures.

The 2-day version is highly recommended over the 1-day version, since Option 1B includes visiting one or more high-pedestrian crash sites, selecting potential countermeasures, and developing a framework for the agency’s pedestrian safety action plan. Option 1A includes only classroom instruction with limited time on developing a pedestrian safety action plan.

Option 2A: Training Course on Designing Streets for Pedestrians Safety (1-Day Course)

Instructors teach attendees roadway designs that affect pedestrian safety, and cover effective countermeasures in great detail.

Option 2B: Training Course on Designing Streets for Pedestrians Safety (2-Day Course)

This option includes all topics in 2A above, plus 1 additional day for field observations of high-pedestrian crash locations with in-class workshops to select candidate countermeasures. Option 2B includes the use of pedestrian crash and other information for a high-crash location or problem area for pedestrians. The Agency will provide relevant crash data, traffic data and other relevant information on the pre-selected locations, as well as condition and collision diagrams for the field exercise.

The 2-day version is highly recommended over the 1-day version, since option 2B includes time in the field reviewing high-pedestrian crash locations as well as a workshop setting to select candidate countermeasures. Option 2A includes only in-class instruction.

All options can be combined in a variety of ways: An agency can select one of the first options (1A or 1B) for their policy/decision makers, and one of the training options (2A or 2B) for their designers and engineers. Some key staff might want to attend both sessions.

Option 1A: Developing a State or Local Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (1-Day Course)

Agenda

Introductions: Attendees introduce themselves, explain how they fit into the pedestrian safety plan for their agency, and what they hope to achieve. Instructors introduce themselves, explain how the course will unfold: interactive, with lots of real world examples

Overview of Guidelines and Safety Literature

- Design Guides – AASHTO Pedestrian Design Guide; MUTCD
- Legal Considerations – Uniform Vehicle Code; State Laws
- Latest Safety Research for FHWA, NHTSA, NCHRP, etc.

Section 1: Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection

- Types of safety projects: Locations, Corridors and Targeted Areas
- Information to identify and quantify pedestrian safety deficiencies
 - Collision data: Computerized records and Police reports
 - Pedestrian counts and behavioral studies
 - Roadway/Sidewalk inventories
 - Traffic characteristics
 - Pedestrian policies and guidelines
 - Pedestrian surveys
 - Needs assessments

Transportation design and planning policies that affect pedestrian safety and countermeasure implementation:

- Street classification, level of service (LOS) and land use
- Accommodating special vehicles (trucks, emergency providers)
- Accommodating other users (bicyclists, pedestrians with disabilities)

Human Factors: Beyond the Data

- The “Design Pedestrian” and Characteristics of Pedestrian Travel
- Characteristics of the Driver
- Walking Level of Quality/Level of Service (LOQ/LOS)

Section 2: Countermeasure Implementation

Stakeholders

- Who are the stakeholders
- Individual citizens
- Citizen based organizations
 - Pedestrian advisory boards (PAB’s)

- Strategies for running effective PAB's
- Geographically based neighborhood groups

Identifying Countermeasures for High-Crash Locations, Corridors, and Targeted Areas

- Methods to identify and prioritize locations, corridors and targeted areas needing treatment: Collision based methods vs. non-crash-based methods
- Evaluating high-crash locations, corridors, or areas
- Long-Term vs. Short-Term Countermeasures: Showing progress

Creating an action plan for making changes to street design & traffic management practices

- Part 1 of an implementation plan- the "Where"
- Part 2 of an implementation plan- the "What"
- Part 3 of an implementation plan- the "How"
- Part 4 of an implementation plan- Adopting pedestrian-friendly design policies and practices ("Institutionalization")
- Part 5 of an implementation plan- Land use, zoning, and site design
- Part 6 of an implementation plan- other measures
- Part 7 of an implementation plan- Evaluation

Funding Strategies

- Safety funds
- Routine accommodation
- Partnership opportunities
- Funding criteria
- Dedicated funds- set asides
- Annual maintenance budget

Common and Effective Pedestrian Safety Practices (Policies, Plans, and Design Guidelines):

(Note: This is a brief overview of treatments. The full-day training course (Option 2) covers this topic in more detail)

- Federal, state, and local design specifications and design guidelines
- Selecting the right treatment to improve pedestrian safety
- Policy and planning solutions
- Enforcement solutions
- Education solutions
- Engineering Solutions
 - Walking along the street
 - Crossing the street
 - Transit-related crossings

Sample Pedestrian Safety Action Plans

Mini-Workshop Session to Develop a Framework for Pedestrian Safety Action Plan for the State or City (Note: This workshop will include the use of pedestrian crash data and other relevant information for the state and/or city of interest).

Option 1B: Developing a State or Local Pedestrian Safety Action Plan (2-Day Course)

Agenda

Prior to the course, agency will receive a self-evaluation form (based on Chapter 7). Once completed, form will be sent to trainers two weeks prior to course. This will allow the course to be customized to better address agency weaknesses. Completed form will be basis for developing an action plan at the two-day course.

Agency will also provide relevant crash and traffic data and other relevant information on the pre-selected locations, as well conditions and collision diagrams for the field exercise.

Day 1

Morning

Introductions: Attendees introduce themselves, explain how they fit into the pedestrian safety plan for their agency, and what they hope to achieve; attendees mention one thing they would like to gain from the course. Instructors introduce themselves, explain how the course will unfold: interactive, with lots of real world examples

Reviewing the Self Evaluation Form

- Instructors review form – point out strengths and weaknesses of current policies, design criteria, management and maintenances practices
- Review used to introduce agenda for next two days

Overview of Guidelines and Safety Literature

- Design Guides – AASHTO Pedestrian Design Guide; MUTCD
- Legal Considerations – Uniform Vehicle Code; State Laws
- Latest Safety Research for FHWA, NHTSA, NCHRP, etc.

Section 1: Data Collection and Analysis

Data Collection

- Types of safety projects: Locations, Corridors and Targeted Areas
- Information to identify and quantify pedestrian safety deficiencies
 - Collision data: Computerized records and Police reports
 - Pedestrian counts and behavioral studies
 - Roadway/Sidewalk inventories
 - Traffic characteristics
 - Pedestrian policies and guidelines
 - Pedestrian surveys
 - Needs assessments

Transportation design and planning policies that affect pedestrian safety and countermeasure implementation:

- Street classification, level of service (LOS) and land use
- Accommodating special vehicles (trucks, emergency providers)
- Accommodating other users (bicyclists, pedestrians with disabilities)

Human Factors: Beyond the Data

- The “Design Pedestrian” and Characteristics of Pedestrian Travel
- Characteristics of the Driver
- Walking Level of Quality/Level of Service (LOQ/LOS)

Afternoon

Field Exercise

- Review pre-collected data on site to be visited (crash data & diagrams, counts, site design, etc)
- Visit site – review problems and possible solutions
- Classroom exercise – develop & present solutions
- Discuss how solutions could be applied on a systems basis to other locations

Day 2

Morning

Section 2: Countermeasure Implementation

Stakeholders

- Who are the stakeholders
- Individual citizens
- Citizen based organizations
 - Pedestrian advisory boards (PAB’s)
 - Strategies for running effective PAB’s
 - Geographically based neighborhood groups

Identifying Countermeasures for High-Crash Locations, Corridors, and Targeted Areas

- Methods to identify and prioritize locations, corridors and targeted areas needing treatment: Collision based methods vs. non-crash-based methods
- Evaluating high-crash locations, corridors, or areas
- Long-Term vs. Short-Term Countermeasures: Showing progress

Creating an action plan for making changes to street design & traffic management practices

- Part 1 of an implementation plan- the “Where”
- Part 2 of an implementation plan- the “What”
- Part 3 of an implementation plan- the “How”
- Part 4 of an implementation plan- Adopting pedestrian-friendly design policies and practices (“Institutionalization”).
- Part 5 of an implementation plan- Land use, zoning, and site design
- Part 6 of an implementation plan- other measures
- Part 7 of an implementation plan- Evaluation

Funding Strategies

- Safety funds
- Routine accommodation

- Partnership opportunities
- Funding criteria
- Dedicated funds- set asides
- Annual maintenance budget

Common and Effective Pedestrian Safety Practices (Policies, Plans, and Design Guidelines):

(Note: This is a brief overview of treatments. The full-day training course (Option 2) covers this topic in more detail)

- Federal, state, and local design specifications and design guidelines
- Selecting the right treatment to improve pedestrian safety
- Policy and planning solutions
- Enforcement solutions
- Education solutions
- Engineering Solutions
 - Walking along the street
 - Crossing the street
 - Transit-related crossings

Afternoon

Sample Pedestrian Safety Action Plans

Workshop Session: Develop a Customized Pedestrian Safety Action Plan for the State or City

- Re-visit self evaluation form that was filled out prior to workshop
- Identify all policies, design guidelines, management and maintenance practices, priorities etc that need changing
- Create draft work plan using form created by presenters (basically the evaluation form with the focus changed from an inventory of “what is” to “what should”)
- Create a list of strategies form implementing work plan
- Set targets for implementing and evaluating progress of work plan

Option 2A: Training Course on Designing Streets for Pedestrians Safety Agenda

Introductions: Attendees introduce themselves, explain their areas of expertise, the problem areas within their agency/jurisdiction, and what they hope to learn. Attendees mention one thing they would like to gain from the course. Instructors introduce themselves, explain how the course will unfold: interactive, with lots of real world examples

Overview of Guidelines and Safety Literature

- Design Guides – AASHTO Pedestrian Design Guide; MUTCD
- Legal Considerations – Uniform Vehicle Code; State Laws
- Latest Safety Research for FHWA, NHTSA, NCHRP, etc.

Planning & Design Factors that Impact Pedestrian Safety:

- Vehicle speed vs. pedestrian safety
- Land use and the layout of cities & streets: making cities pedestrian friendly
- Access management, site design
- LOS – how it determines the ultimate street width
- Accommodating large vehicles – how it impacts intersection design

Basics of Sidewalk Design & Operation:

- How sidewalks improve pedestrian safety
- How shoulders help pedestrian safety
- Sidewalk design: width, clearance, accessibility, and surface
- Sidewalk buffers
- Driveway & alley placement & design
- Illumination for nighttime pedestrian safety & security
- Maintaining sidewalk continuity during construction

Intersection Design:

- Geometric concerns – the need to keep intersections tight, simple, & at right angles
- Techniques to overcome wide, complex, or skewed intersections: refuge islands, curb extensions
- Crosswalk placement at skewed and complex intersections
- Proper design of right-turn bypass islands
- Roundabouts: proper design and essential pedestrian safety considerations

Transit:

- Bus stop location, spacing, design and accessibility
- Bus stops and crossing the street

Street Crossings:

- Principles of human behavior
- Walking speed and the “design pedestrian”
- The need to provide safe, frequent and convenient crossings
- Midblock vs. Intersection crossing safety
- Latest research on pedestrian crossing safety

Street Crossing Treatments:

- Marked Crosswalks: justification, where they can help; crosswalk marking design
- Advance stop bars: how they can reduce multiple threat crashes
- Medians & islands: break up long crossings into two easier crossings
- Offset or staggered crosswalks at pedestrian islands
- Other ways to narrowing crossing distances: Road Diets, Curb Extensions & Bike Lanes
- Traffic management techniques to reduce vehicle speeds
- Lighting at crosswalks: good lighting design practices
- Grade-separation: why it fails, where it's applicable, how to make it succeed

Traffic Signals:

- The purpose of traffic signals; how they improve or compromise pedestrian safety
- Meeting warrants for pedestrians
- Push-button & pedestrian signal head placement: The need to provide a quick response
- Accessible pedestrian signals
- Walking speed and traffic signal timing:
 1. Impact of pedestrians on overall signal timing and cycle lengths
 2. Relationship between the WALK interval and clearance (flashing DON'T WALK) time: maximum WALK vs. maximum clearance intervals
- Signal phasing techniques that can improve pedestrian safety: leading vs. lagging pedestrian phase; restricting turn movements; all pedestrian scramble; ;
- Countdown pedestrian signals and other ITS applications
- Innovative pedestrian signal techniques such as two-phase crossings, half-signals, the Tucson HAWK

Education and Enforcement Their role on Pedestrian Safety

Pedestrian Countermeasure Selection System: PEDSAFE

Wrap-up, Open Discussion: Participants and instructors brainstorm methods to incorporate these pedestrian safety designs into regular practice and at sample locations identified as high crash locations identified by the agency. Participants will also review and assess other pedestrian crash locations that have similar characteristics to high pedestrian crash locations.

Option 2B: Training Course on Designing Streets for Pedestrians Safety (2-Day Course)

This option includes all topics in 2A above, plus 1 additional day for field observations of high-pedestrian crash locations with in-class workshops to select candidate countermeasures. Option 2B includes the use of pedestrian crash and other information for a high-crash location or problem area for pedestrians. The Agency will provide relevant crash data, traffic data and other relevant information on the pre-selected locations, as well as condition and collision diagrams for the field exercise.

The 2-day version is highly recommended over the 1-day version, since option 2B includes time in the field reviewing high-pedestrian crash locations, as well as a workshop setting to select candidate countermeasures. Option 2A includes only in-class instruction.