

# Solano Active Transportation Public Review Comments and Response Matrix

Updated 04.22.2020

Entity/Individual	Comment	Resolution
City Of Vacaville	Projects transferred from list to SR2S need to have the same recommendations. The Vacaville SR2S projects still say Class IV, should say "needs further study."	Addressed. Reviewed all projects in all project lists (e.g., SRTS, Transit...etc.) to make sure they match the latest updates to the project recommendations in the Plan.
City of Fairfield	Please add a Class I path from the south portal of the Train Station to Vanden High School.	Addressed. Added this facility to the map and project list.
City of Vallejo	The Florida St between Sutter St & Alameda St section (746b) should be class III, and not remove on-street parking.	Addressed. Map is updated and project details are revised in project list.
	Mare Island Causeway, (706a) should be noted on maps and tables as an existing CIII and planned CI, consistent with general plan revisions going to Council on 2/11.	Addressed. Map is updated and project details are revised in project list.
	Table VL-1 is mislabeled as for the City of Dixon	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan.
	Figure VL-6 on page 7 leaves significant portions the existing CII and CIII network off the map. See attached COV amended GP Bicycle Network .pdf.	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan.
	Add the Mare Island Causeway as an existing CIII to figure VL-6 on page 7. See attached COV amended GP Bicycle Network .pdf.	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan.
	Figure VL-4 on page 5 should be updated to reflect existing CIII data	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan.
	On page 15, the text should be revised to reflect that the local backbone network is advisory only and that final authority for all roadway operations, uses, and design lies with the City Council of the City of Vallejo, as represented in the City's adopted General Plan	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan. Language was revised per request.
	The text on page 20 should be revised to note which of these recommendations are currently unfunded, and include a recommendation that STA continues to partner with cities to identify relevant funding sources.	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan. Language was revised per request.
	The list on page 20 should be described as an unconstrained list of projects, not a planned list of projects. I recommend using lable like "strategic vision" or "strategic plan"	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan. Language was revised per request.
The text on page 20 should identify that these are the priorities identified by the STA team, and should discuss what STA's next steps are to identify resources for these projects.	Already addressed in previous version of the Plan. Language was revised per request.	
Although the Bluff Trail is covered in the Vallejo General Plan Mobility section it is NOT covered in the draft ATP, including the detailed Vallejo appendix.	Addressed. Existing segment was renamed Vallejo Bluff Trail, realigned, added to regional trail project list, regional trail map, regional trail section of the Plan, Vallejo project list, Vallejo Recommended project map, and the Vallejo Near-term action Plan. This project is shown as Project 730A.	

Joseph Green-Heffern (Sierra Club)	I support what appears to be a comprehensive effort toward providing a needed county-wide framework for guiding pedestrian and bike access improvements by individual cities as we'll as in rural areas that connect our various communities.	Declaration of support for Plan, no action needed, support noted.
	I endorse the plan being built on a comprehensive vision for active transportation, in particular its integration with overall land use/transportation plans, its inclusion of a "backbone" for overall connectivity, and its incorporation of design standards for more uniformity in implementation.	Declaration of support for Plan, no action needed, support noted.
	I support the plan's focus on achieving key goals of broader community access and increased active mode usage, improved safety, better land use, and reductions in Vehicle Miles Traveled. Active transportation modes are the key to building more sustainable communities and leveraging investments in transit to reduce automobile dependence and greenhouse gases driving climate change. As a resident of Fairfield, I fully support prioritization of Complete Streets and trails projects that encourage active transportation in the City's Priority Development Areas and to transit hubs. These include the planned West Texas improvements associated with the Heart of Fairfield PDA and the links to the new Fairfield/Vacaville Train Station and the Solano Express Bus Routes connection at the Fairfield TRansit Center.	Declaration of support for Plan, no action needed, support noted.
	I encourage individual cities in the County to adopt the ATP an overall framework to guide improvements in their respective jurisdictions, and also to cooperate with STA and prioritize improvements that support the "backbone" interconnections between cities. That being said; I encourage STA to allow individual cities flexibility in implementing the plan - for example in the possible need to adjust the location of the "backbone" or downgrade or upgrade design standards for route segments based on local needs or ROW constraints.	Comment noted, STA gives local cities the flexibility to adopt some or all part of local plans and provides implementation flexibility. No changes to Plan needed.
	As a daily biker and walker in Fairfield, I also encourage the STA and the City to cooperate for early implementation of improvements along Rockville and Suisun Valley Roads, Business Center Drive and Abernathy Road to better connect the Green Valley/Cordelia and Downtown areas of Fairfield, with and across the rural areas in Suisun Valley, and across I-80.	Comment noted, no changes to Plan needed, encourages near term action between STA and the City of Fairfield.
	The ATP does not include any discussion of electric bicycles or scooters. The rapid evolution and adoption of these modes is expected to expand the range of commuters to transit hubs and between attractor/generator pairs, and this could impact active transportation demand (e.g., more and longer active commutes) and unsafe regulations (limitation of scooters on some Complete Streets due to pedestrian conflicts and safety concerns). Even though their use and impact is still evolving, and their adoption in Solano County is not widespread and may vary by community, it seems prudent that the ATP at least include a brief section discussing the potential impact on design standards, potential impact on active transportation patterns, and the likely need for guidelines in a future ATP amendment or General Plan updates.	A recommendation for the development of a countywide micromobility and bikeshare policy and program is identified on page 45 in the "Multimodal Mobility and Transit Access" section of the recommended programs. The Technical Advisory Committee supports this recommendation but did not select it as one of the top five programmatic recommendations.
David Wagner (Benicia Resident)	As a Benicia resident I want to see protected protected bike lanes especially around freeway ramps because that would increase local recreation. More protected lanes on East 2nd, and of course on 1st street would lead to much more bike trips into downtown.	Declaration of support for Plan and recommended bikeways on 1st Street and E 2nd Street, no action needed, support noted.
	I appreciate current plans between the area of the State Park and the Southampton loop.	Declaration of support for Plan, no action needed, support noted.
	Best to connect Benicia and Vallejo via bike. I commute to work on Mare Island and wish there was a safer route through Benicia Dr/Lemon/Curtola/ or Glen Cove into Waterfront.	Declaration of support for Plan, no action needed, support noted.

	Safer waterfront biking options will help grown downtown Vallejo and encourage biking to the ferry. I support plan to extend multi-use path on the edges of Glen Cove and connecting to Sonoma which would help with bridge to bridge connections.	Declaration of support for Plan, no action needed, support noted.
City of Benicia	Biennial Review. Please consider implementing biennial review of the Active Transportation Plan so that the plan, or its appendices, may be aligned with local plans.	The Action 6.A.2 has been updated to: "Action 6.A.2: Encourage the review of projects identified in the Solano Active Transportation Plan and update project lists/appendices annually to align projects with local efforts, identify projects that have been completed, and work to fund connected facilities.
	Existing conditions map addition: Class I along Rose between Jack London Park and McAllister (collocated with Class II/III segments)	Class I already on map, but difficult to see since they are next to each other, Class I re-drawn.
	Existing conditions map addition: The shoreline trail between B and G Streets, which is currently shown on 1st Street instead of along the shoreline outside of a street Right of Way. The adjacent segment of shoreline trail along Semple Crossing/Gull Point/H should not be shown as an existing bicycle facility as it has not been designated or developed as such.	Existing and proposed Bay Trail segments have been updated.
	Existing conditions map addition: West K Street to Claverie Way to West J Street to W. 2nd is the County Bike Route (Class III)	Class III Bike Route for Countywide Bike Route has been added to the map.
	Bicycle Projects: The Plan should recommend implementation of Bay Trail, Ridge Trail and Delta Trail gap closures including from East 5th Street to the shoreline.	Declaration of support for Bay Trail gap closures noted. Regional trails are a Plan priority.
	Bicycle Projects: The classification of various bicycle routes should be further evaluated for feasibility, impacts to on-street parking and integration with existing trails.	add this language to Plan in paragraph introducing recommended bike projects?
	Bicycle Projects: Class III segments on Warwick, Seaview, and Chelsea Hills that are adopted in the Benicia General Plan.	Added currently undesignated facilities as Class IIIs, any upgraded recommendations were left as is but the gaps were filled in as Class III Bike Routes.
	Bicycle Projects: Please address Class III integration on the East side of Benicia (E. 3rd, E. 5th, Hillcrest), in addition to proposed Open Space Class I facility.	Class III Bike Route added on 5th St to extend access to proposed open space trail. Class III Bike Boulevard added on Hillcrest Ave. No change made to 3rd St since it does not connect through.
	Bicycle Projects: The proposed bicycle network does not include Transportation & Employment Center Plan recommendations for E. 2nd and Lake Herman Road	Upgraded project section of lake herman from Class III to Class II to match TEC Plan. A Class I sidepath has been added in addition to the Class IV on-street facility which remains to keep connectivity with on-street facilities further along 2nd St.
	Bicycle Projects: Recommendations for Class IV on Military East from East 2nd Street to Adams would remove on-street parking; this recommendation warrants further community outreach and technical evaluation.	comment noted, text added to plan.

<p>Bicycle Projects: Please consider adjusting the Civic Center bikeway alignment as both ends of the currently proposed alignment are steep and difficult hills, with no pathway in place linking from the library to K Street. Instead, please route a class III on E. 4th Street, from Military to E. L Street, then E. L to 1st Street using the existing pathway directly adjacent to the library within the vacated E. L Street Right of Way.</p>	<p>We received complaints from pedestrians regarding cyclists using the existing path adjacent to the library and the walk audit group recommended the creation of a new connection to K St to bypass the busy portion of 1st St approaching Military E. No changes were made.</p>
<p>Bicycle Projects: Please consider a Class III alignment on Solano and Larkin, between Rose and Panorama.</p>	<p>Added to map and project list.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Projects: Clarifications are needed for pedestrian projects, including the scope of individual projects and integration with the Safe Routes to Schools Plan and recommended bikeway infrastructure.</p>	<p>Pedestrian project locations are identified but are not scoped as part of this project. These locations should be further vetted by City staff following this effort.</p>
<p>Corridor studies are recommended for East 5th, East 2nd and Military East, in addition to the priority recommendations for Complete Streets plans for West Military and First Street; additional Complete Streets analysis may be appropriate for the Civic Center Campus and East H Street.</p>	<p>Comment noted. All projects in the Plan can included further analysis at the City's discretion prior to implementation. No changes made.</p>
<p>Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure on the east side of town is not adequately addressed, including opportunities on Hillcrest, East 3rd and East 5th Streets.</p>	<p>Added recommended bikeways on Hillcrest (Class III Bike Boulevard), East 3rd (Class III Bike Boulevard), and extended the existing recommended bikeway on E 5th north (Class II and Class III)</p>
<p>Recommendations for the Industrial Park should align with the Transportation and Employment Center (TEC) Plan, which identifies opportunities for shared used paths in specific locations and balances the unique characteristics of the Industrial Park with bike and pedestrian</p>	<p>The ATP includes path recommendations on Park Rd and Industrial Blvd. The path recommendation parallel to 2nd St has been added.</p>
<p>On Southampton Road, there is a need to integrate Safe Routes to School/ Class IV /Pedestrian recommendations</p>	<p>Comment noted, recommendations can be combined for more comprehensive Safe Routes to School projects.</p>
<p>The City of Benicia has previously provided recommendations on intersection and freeway interchanges. We request that these be considered and reflected in the ATP.</p>	<p>Additional details are needed. Bikeway recommendations at interchanges were incorporated as well as sidewalk gap closures. Other projects can be added if identified.</p>

Kathleen Catton (Benicia Resident)	Benicia has approx. 56% of Maximum sidewalk coverage, only Rio Vista has less at 42%, other cities are in 70% range. This should be a priority.	Comment noted. The Plan highlights the importance of filling sidewalk gaps and the supporting analysis documents in the appendix provide more specific details about the different sidewalk gap analyses completed for the Plan.
	In addition, I am concerned that the bike and pedestrian plans consider lower class or combined walks and bike lanes than the majority prefer, and do not consider the preferences of 51-56% of the bicyclists comfort typology....page 5 “Often (bicyclists) not comfortable with bike lanes, may bike on sidewalks even if bike lanes are provided, prefer off-street or separate bicycle facilities or quiet traffic-calmed residential roads. May not bike at all if bicycle facilities do not meet needs for perceived comfort.” I feel this comfort level also applies to pedestrian walkways as well.	Comment noted. The bicycle and pedestrian recommendations for the Plan were developed to meet the safety and comfort preferences of bicyclists and pedestrians of all ages and abilities. In some cases, City staff and members of the project team indicated that the most comfortable facility was not possible given local roadway conditions, in those cases, the most comfortable facility feasible was recommended. Design considerations for pedestrian comfort including landscaped buffers from vehicle traffic are included in the Design Toolkit appendix.
	Backbone Network Priorities – rate Benicia lower than expected – in fact the plans ignores Benicia completely for backbone projects a. High demand routes running through Vallejo – which is ignoring the paths/routies to the 680/780 corridor.	Comment noted. Refer to the memos in the appendix for details about how the locations in the countywide backbone network were identified. The countywide backbone network connects to Benicia and the Benicia Plan includes several local backbone network projects in Benicia that will help Benicia residents connect to the countywide network.
	Bicycle priority projects – ignore some obvious bike networks that should be considered a. Benicia to Vallejo Transit Center b. Downtown Benicia to East Second Street corridor – break in linkage c. Bicycle priority projects are not connecting into Benicia or including Benicia specific projects	Comment noted. The bicycle priority projects identify many connections to and within Benicia. Refer to the Benicia Plan for a more detailed view of these projects. For (a) the countywide backbone network proposes completing connections from Benicia to Vallejo along the Bay Trail to the Ferry and Transit Center; (b) connections are proposed from the E 2nd St to 1st St with an upgraded connection along Military; and (c) backbone priority projects are proposed along Columbus Parkway and the Bay Trail to connect with Vallejo and the Lopes Rd connection in Unincorporated Solano County ranks fairly high for the County.

<p>Pedestrian Backbone projects did not address the gaps in pedestrian sidewalks in Benicia downtown let alone the East Second Corridor to downtown</p>	<p>Comment noted. Refer to the memo in the appendix for more information on how the backbone network and sidewalk gaps were identified. A few downtown sidewalk gaps are shown in this project and highlighted in the pedestrian project list for Benicia. The final list pedestrian projects highlighted in the Benicia Plan was developed by City of Benicia Staff. Given the scale of all citywide sidewalk gap closures, it was necessary to prioritize areas for initial investment, other gaps could still be filled over time.</p>
<p>Regional Trails Bicycle Network do not show connectivity in northern portion of Benicia with regional trails in the downtown...connection should be in planning</p>	<p>Comment noted. Unsure what is meant by connection should be in planning, but only existing connections identified by project development team and key stakeholders were included in the regional trails bicycle network. Planned trail projects can be added to the recommended bicycle network if trail alignment and extends are provided. Some unpaved trails are not included since trails in this Plan are intended to meet CA MUTCD Class I standards per Caltrans requirements.</p>
<p>Benicia Prioritization confirms the safety 35% pedestrian and 24% for bicyclists as the highest aggregate of concern – yet project class level does not reflect concern</p>	<p>Comment noted. This discussion is no longer in the plan.</p>
<p>Bicycle inventory indicates 85% of facilities do not have a designated bicycle facility in Benicia - this is of concern, even if the traffic stress is 73% least stressful...That leaves a need gap</p>	<p>Comment noted, and supports need for developing bicycle network in Benicia. It is also important to note that some roadways in Benicia are local, residential streets with low vehicles volumes and/or speeds, these roadways do not normally need specific facility designations to be comfortable for bicyclists.</p>
<p>Sidewalk Coverage for East Second Street and Industrial park are noticeably absent...walking on East Street is hazardous people walk from residential on Rose Drive to Downtown and to Industrial Park Transit Centers ...this should be a priority</p>	<p>Comment noted. Priority pedestrian projects were developed by City of Benicia staff, this concern can be raised by them and addressed in future planning efforts. Class I Multi-Use paths are proposed in the Industrial Park area on Park Road and Industrial Way for shared use by cyclists and pedestrians to the Transit Center. East Second Street has identified gaps but is not located on the backbone network given the longer distance for pedestrians from Rose Drive into Downtown. However, the City can still pursue gap closure projects in these locations.</p>
<p>Bike Network is weak in Benicia with significant multi-use paths in downtown with low safety factor – Once again the paths to industrial park are limited or non-existent.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Unclear what 'multi-use paths in downtown with low safety factor' refers to. There are several protected bikeways and multi-use paths recommended to increase access to and from the industrial park.</p>

Biking has increased significantly on weekends on Reservoir and Lake Herman Roads with no paths yet priority for this area is low.

Comment noted. This information should be shared with stakeholders, as those areas were not identified as high-priority areas among stakeholders during the prioritization workshop.

San Fransisco Bay Trail	The Vallejo Bluff Trail has completed the design and CEQA phases but is not included in the plan. A metric is needed to capture and prioritize a project like this that has lots of local support.	The Vallejo Bluff Trail has been included in the Plan on the map and project list for recommended bikeways.
	Happy to see a focus on "all ages" and abilities but project needs to put more emphasis on Class I multi use paths being the best for all ages and abilities.	Comment is noted. Per bikeway planning and design best practices, class I facilities are not always the best option for an all ages and abilities network. In addition, in some cases class I paths were not the preferred option among City staff and other stakeholders who participated in Plan development. Class I paths are applicable in certain situations. The Plan recognizes the importance of these facilities, highlights regional trails, and recommends providing appropriate separation between motor vehicles and bicyclists where appropriate.
	p. 15 Under "Health and Safety" Goal/Action, an objective of this plan should encourage complete seperation of bike/peds from traffic via class I multi use paths as these are best suited for all ages and abilities.	Existing evidence does not support this exact statement, however, encouraging the separation of bikes/peds from motor vehicles when motor vehicle volumes and/or speeds are high is a best practice. An action item encouraing appropriate separation between motor vehicles and vulnerable road users has been added (action 3.A.7)
	p. 16 Quality of life, Objective 4a is to link active tranportation facilities. The Solano County regional trails embody this objective and should be highlighted	Comment noted. The Solano County trails are specified in the actions. The objective statements are meant to be broader statements than the actions so that they remain applicable over time. The action statements provide reference and support to specific projects, including the Solano County regional trails.
	p 16. Action 4a1, please consider this change: "Support the completion of regional trails that including SF Bay Trail, the Bay Area Ridge Trail, and the Napa Valley Vine Trail".	Action 4ab addresses this request and mentions these specific trails already, no change made.
	p 21. The "percentage of Roadway Mileage" graphic makes no sense. Seems to imply that 77% of Solano which has no designated facility is "least stressfull".	The majority of roadway mileage in Solano County are residential streets, these streets are categorized as low stress due to low motor vehicle volumes and speeds. This approach follows best practices for calculating level of stress. All roadways are included since cyclists may operate similar to motor vehicles in those situations and are permitted. No change made.



<p>p22 Figure 13: The Class III graphic implies there is separation between cars and bikes. There is not. For this reason, Class III should not be pursued as a facility type that will accommodate all ages and abilities.</p>	<p>Class III facilities include routes in rural areas with shoulders and class III bicycle boulevards. Well-designed, bicycle-friendly shoulders do provide separation between motor vehicles and bicyclists and a bicycle boulevard located on an appropriate, low-volume, low-speed street is considered appropriate for people of all ages and abilities and does not require separation between modes. No change made.</p>
<p>p24 Figure 15: The figure implies that a toddler alone on a bike would use a shared lane with traffic at speeds up to 25, a bike lane with high traffic, and 2-3 lanes up to 25 mph. This suggestion does not make sense.</p>	<p>The figure does not specify a toddler, merely someone who is not an adult. The figure also indicates speeds less than 25 mph are appropriate for younger riders, not including 25 mph, and that in higher traffic or multi-lane conditions greater separation between bicyclists and motor vehicles is needed. Bicycle planning and design best practices indicate that the conditions shown in the graphic are appropriate for most bicyclists. No change made.</p>
<p>p 25 Figure 16: The listing interstates as "high stress" bike facilities does a disservice to the whole notion of Levels of Stress as bicycle and pedestrians are prohibited from their use.</p>	<p>The level of traffic stress analysis is a well-known methodology for measuring bicycle traffic stress. Highways are often included in this analysis. At this stage there is not enough budget to re-run the analysis excluding interstates. No change made.</p>
<p>p 27 Figure 17: Title says "Countywide Bicycle Network Analysis Connectivity" but legend says "Bicycle Level of Traffic Stress". Which is it? Either way it doesn't make a lot of sense. The marsh north of SR 37 is either high stress or high connectivity.</p>	<p>Addressed previous Plan revisions. The analysis is shown in the figure is a connectivity analysis but it integrates results from several data sources, including the level of traffic stress analysis which explain why this area received the results it did. Refer to the Appendix for analysis methodology details. No change made.</p>
<p>p. 46 Safety Criteria Points. Long blurb provided <a href="#">in red on separate document</a></p>	<p>Comment noted. An action item was added to the Plan to encourage a systemic safety approach. The scoring criteria was developed by the plan development team and reflects the interests and priorities selected by staff from local jurisdictions. The ranking was then approved by jurisdiction staff and/or they requested adjustments to the scoring criteria before approving the ranked project list. No change to the prioritization ranking criteria was made.</p>

<p>p 46: Under the heading "Seperation between modes" class III is listed. Class III represents zero seperation between modes and should not receive points.</p>	<p>Class III facilities include routes in rural areas with shoulders and class III bicycle boulevards. Well-designed, bicycle-friendly shoulders do provide separation between motor vehicles and bicyclists and a bicycle boulevard located on an appropriate, low-volume, low-speed street is considered comfortable for people of all ages and abilities. No change made.</p>
<p>p.50: Under "connectivity improvements from phased implementation" last sentence of section should reflect that class I facilities can and often should supplant on street facilites as they are the safest type and will attract the most users</p>	<p>Best practices for bicycle network development indicate that Class I facilities should not supplant on-street facilities. In many cases Class I facilities are not more convenient than on-street facilities since they may not directly access all destinations which change by land-use. There are also significant limitations to where Class I facilities can feasibly be installed and in many cases these locations are not where people live or where people travel to. No change made.</p>
<p>p 54: Health and Safety Performance Metrics: Its important to note that focusing resources on locations with a high number of crashes is not neccesarily the most prudent course of action. A gap closure on a regional trail may offer a superior solution.</p>	<p>The health and safe action items in the Plan were revised to reflect this request, however, the performance metric monitoring the number of bicycle and pedestrian collisions is still an important (and best practice) performance measure to include in the plan.</p>
<p>p.54: Long blurb provided <b>in red on separate document</b></p>	<p>Addressed The comment refers to a missing table of performance metrics. The table of performance measures it shown on page 56. This comment may have been made to an initial draft version of the Plan before the performance metrics were included. .</p>
<p>Regional Trails Bike Table: Discrepancies between proposed facility listed in the table and the actual type proposed in Bay Trail Project. Clarification on area from Lighthouse Drive north the Napa County line provided by Parisi Associates.</p>	<p>Addressed. Map updated to reflect trails proposed by the Bay Trail project, except in locations where City staff provided specific guidance on recommended facilities. The proposed segment of the Bay Trail up to the Napa County line has been added to the map.</p>
<p>Note that a class III Bicycle Boulevard does not meet Bay Trail standards and is not a facility type that is recognized as either proposed or complete Bay Trail.</p>	<p>This is noted, local jurisdictions are not willing to make upgraded facilities in some residential areas. This discrepancy will need to be resolved in future planning efforts between local jurisdictions and the Bay Trail Board.</p>
<p>Benicia chapter, Page 3: ATP gender graphic makes no sense</p>	<p>Comment noted. Refer to the appendix for more details on the limitations of the data presented in the graphic. No change made.</p>

p5: Percent of Roadway mileage and traffic stress makes no sense	The majority of roadway mileage in Solano County are residential streets, these streets are categorized as low stress due to low motor vehicle volumes and speeds. This approach follows best practices for calculating level of stress. No change made.
p7: In regards to existing bike network map there is no existing class II on residential streets between downtown and BSRA. Should be yellow at best.	Assuming this relates to the class II on W 7th St. We were told by the City of Benicia that there is a class II on this street and Google Earth confirms the presence of a class II facility. No change made.
p8: Hi stess figure shows I-780. Bikes prohibited from using interstates so this makes no sense.	See previous response to this type of comment.
P9: Benicia marsh shows hi connectivity? Does not make sense.	Connectivity is based on a variety of factors, see appendix for detailed discussion of methodology and its limitations. No change made.
On Benicia maps, shows both an existing Class I, an existing bike route, and a proposed class IV on 1st street. Believe there is only proposed Class IV and Class III. There is no class I on West F	Addressed. Existing and proposed facilities revised.
Vallejo Maps: Existing Class II and Class I missing on Maritime Academy Drive	Addressed. Maps and data have been updated.
Wilson Avenue from Lighthouse Drive north to Napa County Border see Parisi drawings for alignment	Addressed. Maps and data have been updated.
Vallejo pg 9. Hi connectivity on the docks at Mare island? Makes no sense.	Connectivity is based on a variety of factors, see appendix for detailed discussion of methodology and its limitations. The BNA measures connectivity between census blocks and since this area has small blocks with the high stress roadways outside of them, the tool only measures that the lower stress local roads are easy to use between these blocks. No change made.
p 22 Figure VL-18: Add all of Bay/Vine Trail to "Recommended all ages/abilites"	Addressed. Maps and data have been updated.
pg. 22 Figure VL-18: Add Vallejo Bluff (Bay/Ridge) Trail to "Recommended All Ages and Abilities"	Addressed. Maps and data have been updated.
p.23 ID numbers 707A,714A,720B, area part of SF Bay Trail. Please note that 720B, Enterprse is a proposed Class IV facility and is part of the Bay/Vine Trail ATP project currently in deisgn and env. Review	Addressed. 720B is shown as a recommended Class IV. Corridor names for this list of projects was revised to show Bay/Vine Trail affiliation.
p. 27 Please add Vallejo Bluff Trail to the list of recommended bikeway projects. The Bay and Ridge Trail via CA coastal conservancy had invested nearly half a million in this project over the last 15 years. Significant progress on design and env review completed.	Addressed in previous Plan update. Vallejo Bluff Trail Project is on the Map and included in the project list. The project name in the project list was revised from Bay Trail to Vallejo Bluff Trail.
pg. 30: Near Term: Bay/Vine Trail project funding building four miles of new separated facilities in North Vallejo should be referenced here as it is in advanced designed beginning env. Review. Led by STA, project is receving \$4.2 milllion ATP grant.	As stated in the text, this section of the Plan reflects responses from a specific workshop about priorities for developing a connected network and may not be representative of all near term projects. No change made.
pg. 30: Please include Vallejo Bluff Trail which the Bay/Ridge Trail have given nearly 500k towards ove the last 15 years. This class I path will connect Glen Cove to DT Vallejo, Carquinez Bridge. Bluff Trail also key part of Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail.	As stated in the text, this section of the Plan reflects responses from a specific workshop about priorities for developing a conncted network and may not be representative of all near term projects. No change made.

	<p>pg 30: Please include the Carquinez Straight Scenic Loop Trail, a joint effort of the Bay/Ridge/Delta/ SF Bay Area Water Trail to close gaps in these trails between Martinez and Benicia. See provided blurb.</p>	<p>A discussion of the Carquinez Straight Scenic Loop Trail was added to the Countywide section of the Plan on page 38 and an existing portion of this trail was added to the map, as well as the Vallejo Bluffs Trails which is part of this loop.</p>
	<p>pg 34: Please add the Vallejo Bluff Trail Project to the list of Recommended ped projects. The Bay/Ridge Trail via the State Coastal Conservancy have invested significant grant funding (500k) over the past 15 years.</p>	<p>Addressed in previous Plan update. Vallejo Bluff Trail Project is on the Map and included in the project list. The name in the project list was revised from Bay Trail to Vallejo Bluff Trail.</p>
<p>Mike Zeiss (Suisun City Resident)</p>	<p>I'm writing to encourage the City of Suisun City to take the formal action of adopting its portion of the Solano County Active Transportation Plan ("the Plan"). However, you may need to tweak the Suisun portion of the Plan to improve residents' access to natural areas. I consider that all Suisun residential areas within 2 miles of a natural area (open space, park, etc.) should have a safe active-transportation route to that natural area. Please direct Planning Department staff to analyze whether the draft Plan would ensure such access. Their analysis should include access to natural areas that are adjacent to, but outside of, city limits, such as Hill Slough.</p> <p>In particular, I encourage Suisun City to increase to "high" the priority for bicycle access to Hill Slough Wildlife Area, adjacent Grizzly Island Road. This could be a magnet for bicycle tourism. I gratefully acknowledge that Councilmember Segala has championed this idea - - let's make sure it gets incorporated into the Plan. Within Appendix A, Table SU-2 does include a "Grizzly Island Trail Extension" project. However, it is only prioritized "Medium", and thus is not included on the map of near-term projects (Figure SU-20). For similar reasons, I encourage increasing to "high" the priority for the connections to Cordelia Road.</p> <p>Though not specific to Suisun City, please note that the draft Plan fails to consider electric bikes and scooters. Their popularity is growing, and probably will affect planning for active transportation (e.g., possible safety concerns for pedestrians). It would seem prudent for the Plan to include analysis of how electric bikes and scooters will affect active transportation patterns and design standards. Lastly, the draft Plan fails to include construction of bike racks. Fellow bicyclists tell me the lack of bike racks at many Suisun stores and restaurants is a deterrent to incorporating active transportation into everyday life. Remainder of comment can be viewed in separate letter.</p>	<p>Support for Suisun City Plan is noted. Interest in prioritizing active transportation connections to natural areas is noted - a desire for connections to natural areas was not noted as a priority among members of the public during public outreach efforts and was therefore not prioritized in this section of the Plan. Additional requests for changes to priority project rankings should be discussed with Suisun City staff. The priority rankings for Suisun City were developed and agreed upon by Suisun City staff and cannot be updated at this stage. Re: addressing electric bikes and scooters. A recommendation for the development of a countywide micromobility and bikeshare policy and program is identified on page 45 in the "Multimodal Mobility and Transit Access" section of the recommended programs. The Technical Advisory Committee supports this recommendation but did not select it as one of the top five programmatic recommendations.</p>
<p>Phillip Sales (Vine Trail)</p>	<p>Short section of SR 37 shows bike facilities that do not exist. Class I trail west of SR-37 incorrectly shown as Class IV, should be Class I, and adjacent facilities shown as Class I on Enterprise/Lewis Brown Rd should be Class IV. A proposed Class I facility is missing between Sonoma Blvd and Broadway, and shown in part as a Class IV along Broadway.</p>	<p>SR-37 facilities incorrectly shown have been removed. Missing Class I facilities have been added, facilities incorrectly labeled as Class IV have been switched to Class I and vice versa as specified by map document sent by Vine Trail.</p>

<p>Bay Area Ridge Trail</p>	<p>I-80/I-680/Hwy 12 Interchange Improvements (RT Gaps 413 &amp; 415):  The Draft ATP does not include the proposed multi-use path from Business Center Drive to McGary Road that is part of the design for the I-80/I-680/Hwy 12 Interchange improvements (RT Gaps 413 &amp; 415). These improvements close a key Ridge Trail Gap between Citadel Drive and McGary Road.</p>	<p>The plan shows the proposed Class I connection from Highway 12 to connect with McGary Rd. Modifications to the route are acceptable to align this proposed facility with the I-80/I-680/Hwy 12 interchange improvements and is not intended to be a standalone project. RT Gaps 413 and 415 are now represented as project 371A in the Fairfield project list and accompanying map.</p>
	<p>The Draft City of Fairfield ATP shows two proposed project segments that generally cover the proposed interchange improvement within the city limits. Bicycle segment 371A Red Tope Road from McGary Road to Highway 12 is proposed as a Class I Multi-Use path and pedestrian segment FA.SG.1 Red Top Road between the railroad and Watt Dr is also identified as a proposed multi-use path. It is unclear if these were intended to reflect the interchange improvement or are separate projects.</p>	<p>These projects can be implemented together or separately depending on funding availability. The Class I Trail along Red Top Road is intended to support access to the Park and Ride and is not dependent on the interchange improvements themselves.</p>
	<p>The Draft Unincorporated Solano County ATP does not include the interchange proposed multi-use path improvements between Business Center Drive and Highway 12/railroad within the unincorporated area. The Unincorporated Solano County ATP should include that portion of the proposed interchange multi-use path improvements within the unincorporated area.</p>	<p>The Solano ATP project ID 371A is inclusive of this small section. However, the portion mentioned is within Unincorporated Solano County. The project should be done in collaboration with the City of Fairfield, Caltrans, Solano Transportation Authority, and Unincorporated Solano County. We will add project 371A to the Unincorporated Solano County project list so it shows in both lists but will not include a cost given the inclusion as part of the interchange project.</p>
	<p>The Draft City of Vallejo ATP does not include the proposed Vallejo Bluff trail. The Vallejo Bluff trail will complete a key gap in the Ridge Trail along with similar gaps in the SF Bay Trail, Great California Delta Trail and Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail. This trail segments provides an important connection between the Glen Cove Neighborhoods and south Vallejo including the Maritime Academy. The Ridge Trail and SF Bay Trail have provided funding to support City efforts to complete the design and environmental review of the trail segment. To date the environmental review and preliminary design have been completed.</p>	<p>The Vallejo Bluff Trail and other regional trails have been added to the Plan and included in the revised maps and project lists.</p>
	<p>The Draft Vallejo ATP includes bike segment 732A SF Bay Trail, Sonoma Blvd to Old Glen Cove Rd Path proposed as a Class I Multi-Use path. This segment as mapped does not follow the alignment for the four regional trails in this area. The description should be modified to reflect the proposed Vallejo Bluff Trail alignment and the alignment should be reflected on map VL-17 Proposed Bicycle Network for Vallejo. Segment 732A, as re-described, should be upgraded to Prioritization "High" on Table VL-3 Vallejo Recommended Bikeway Project List since this an ongoing project. Preliminary design and environmental review have been completed.</p>	<p>Trail project alignments were updated the alignment per comment from the San Francisco Bay Trail Planner's review. The Vallejo Bluff Trail project is marked as high priority in the project list.</p>
	<p>Solano County has completed the purchase of the Brown Property located off American Canyon Road north of I-80 and have constructed trail staging area improvements. The property will shortly be conveyed to the Solano Land Trust and an extension of the Ridge Trail from Lynch Canyon will be constructed to American Canyon Road through the Souza and Brown properties. Solano Land Trust is currently working to purchase the Souza property.</p>	<p>Comment noted, no change made.</p>

<p>Currently, there is no safe crossing over I-80 from Brown Property to the existing Hiddenbrooke Ridge Trail segment at the entrance to the Hiddenbrooke subdivision on the south side of I-80. With the closing of the informal parking area on McGary Road by the Hiddenbrooke entrance on the south side of I-80 and the opening the new trail staging area north of I-80, along with the extension of the Ridge Trail to American Canyon Road, a safe bicycle and pedestrian crossing of I-80 has become more imperative. We would request that the draft ATP include as a proposed project, bicycle and pedestrian safety improvements to the I-80/ American Canyon/Hiddenbrooke Interchange.</p>	<p>A new project (1001C) has been added to the unincorporated Solano County recommended project list and map to support the I-80 crossing.</p>
<p>1. Figure 27 Regional Trails and Local Jurisdiction Off-street Trail Priority Projects.</p> <p>This figure is confusing and does not clearly delineate the regional trails. There are errors in the regional trail alignments as shown on the map. We should recommend that a new figure with just Regional Trails be prepared which shows clearly the existing and proposed segments of the Ridge Trail, SF Bay Trail, Great California Delta Trail and the Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail. The figure could indicate where ATP projects are proposed within the regional trail alignments. It is recommended that there be a separate figure for each Regional Trail and local off-street projects not related to the regional trails should be shown on a separate figure. The Ridge Trail shared an GIS shape file for the alignment both planned and dedicated in 2019 and again in 2020.</p>	<p>A new regional trails map was created that more accurately reflects planned regional trail alignments.</p>
<p>Pgs. 36-37.</p> <p>Regional Trails, including the Ridge Trail, SF Bay Trail, Great California Delta Trail and Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail are summarized. The summaries provide a good description of each of the regional trails.</p>	<p>Support for Plan is noted, no additional changes needed.</p>
<p>Appendix D Third Table - Regional Trails Bicycle Network Recommendations</p> <p>This table lists all the recommended bicycle improvements that are located along the Ridge Trail, SF Bay Trail and Vine Trail. Missing from this table are the Bike/Ped improvements that are part of the I80/I680/HW12 interchange project within the unincorporated area from Business Center Drive to the Fairfield City limits at the railroad just south of Highway 12.</p>	<p>The Class I Ridge Trail improvement for the I80/I680/HW12 interchange project as been added as a project to the Plan and added to the Regional Trails project list in Appendix D.</p>
<p>Appendix D Third Table - Regional Trails Bicycle Network Recommendations The table also does not cover any of the pedestrian improvements along Ridge Trail or other regional segments. A separate table of the pedestrian improvements that are located along all the regional trails should also be included in this Appendix.</p>	<p>No change made. Class I trail improvements incorporate both bicycle and pedestrian improvements but are only listed once as trail projects and are listed as part of the bike network project list in the Plan.</p>
<p>Appendix A This appendix includes the individual city and unincorporated County ATP plans. Tables in each of the Draft ATP plans include a column labeled "Cost". It is unclear how these costs were determined but some seem high. For example, in the Draft Benicia ATP, Figure B-3 project 101A Columbus Parkway to Palace Court is 0.37 miles and the cost is \$514,300. Please explain how these costs were determined.</p>	<p>Comment noted, no changes made. Appendix B includes a cost assumptions memo that details the assumptions and methodology for cost estimates.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Benicia ATP</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- Pgs. 21-25, Figure B-17 Proposed Bicycle network and Table B-3 Recommended Bikeway Project List</p> <p>The proposed bike projects address two Ridge Trail gaps, Rose Drive (RT Gap 441) and Military E (RT Gap 450). Project 101A Rose Drive is a proposed Class III Bicycle Route from Columbus Parkway past KinderCare. Project 144c is a proposed Class II Bicycle Lane on Military East.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">In addition, the plan includes bicycle improvements that support the Ridge Trail as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>121A bike Class III Boulevard on K, I and J streets,</li> <li>120B 1st St. Class IV Separated bikeway,</li> <li>131A Adams Street, Class III Boulevard. This project would greatly improve the bike access from Park St to Military St.</li> <li>118A Class I Multi Use Path. I think it is from E5th street along the marina parking lot entrance road where there is a dirt ped. path along the roadway to the Marina.</li> <li>101A Dillion Point road through BSRA a Class I Multi Use path along roadway. 119A The lower portion of E. 5th St from Marina to E. H, a Class II Bicycle Lane.</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;">Segments 121A, 120B, 144C, 101A, and 131A, are listed as "High" prioritization Segments 118B 100A and 119A are listed as "Medium" prioritization</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Pgs. 26 – 29, Near Term Implementation Bike Network Projects</p> <p>The proposed 101A Rose Drive Bike Class III bike route is a Near Term Implementation Project. Figure B-20 shows the Rose Drive Project. Military E would remain a Class III bike route in the near term. We recognize the challenge to improve Military E to a Class II Bicycle Lane and the need for further study given the roadway width and exiting parking.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">-Pg. 30 Recommended Pedestrian Projects</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Support for Plan is noted, no additional changes needed.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Fairfield ATP</p> <p style="text-align: center;">- Pgs. 21 &amp; 29, Figure FA-17 Proposed Bicycle network and Table FA-3 Recommended Bikeway Project List</p> <p>Two bike projects in Fairfield are on the Ridge Trail alignment. 308C a Class I Multi-Use Trail which would extent the Multi Use Trail from the East Ridge Subdivision north to the city limits where the trail enters the main part of Rockville Hills Park (which is in the unincorporated county). This project has a "Low" prioritization rank. This segment is currently a dirt hiking trail.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comment is noted, no changes made.</p>
<p>Fairfield ATP 371A is Red Tope Road from McGary Road to Highway 12 is proposed as a Class I Multi-Use path. This project is identified as a "Low" Prioritization. This covers two Ridge Trail gaps, Gap 415, I-80 to McGary and a portion of Gap 413, Citadel to I-80. It is unclear if these are intended to reflect the proposed interchange bike/pedestrian improvements since no reference is made to the interchange. This proposed path nevertheless covers the portion of what would be included in the interchange improvements within Fairfield City Limits. It should receive a "High" prioritization rank as it is already a part of the approved interchange project.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Revised project ranking to "High".</p>

<p>Fairfield ATP - Pg. 34, Near Term Implementation Bike Network Projects Neither segment 308C or 371A are shown as Near Term Implementation Project on Figure FA-20 Fairfield Near Term Action Plan Bikeway Network.</p>	<p>These two projects were not included in the near-term network because they were not identified during the near-term network workshop in Fairfield. However, these two projects play a key role in increasing access to the regional trail network. Language noting their importance has been added to the near-term implementation discussion.</p>
<p>Fairfield ATP - Pg. 35, Recommended Pedestrian Projects. Only a portion of the proposed segment FA.SG.1 that does not cover the Ridge Trail gap is a recommended pedestrian project.</p>	<p>Comment is noted, no changes made. All trail projects were classified as Class I Trails and are incorporated in the bicycle project sections. They are not intended to be duplicated in the pedestrian section even though they serve both user groups.</p>
<p>Fairfield ATP - Pgs. 37-38 Priority Pedestrian Projects. Segment FA.SG.1 Red Top Road between the railroad and Watt Dr is identified as a proposed priority project. This follows the same route as the proposed Bike segment 308C, a Class I Multi-Use path and both should have a "high" prioritization rank as part of the approved interchange project.</p>	<p>The identified pedestrian projects are shown as sidewalk gaps. These are prioritized separately from the regional trail improvement project. Both could be implemented at the same time. No changes made to the Plan.</p>
<p>Vallejo ATP As discussed above, the Vallejo Bluff project is missing from the Draft ATP Plan.</p>	<p>The Bluff Trail was added in a previous iteration of the plan. It is now shown in the map, in the project list, and in the regional trails list.</p>
<p>Vallejo ATP Segment 732A Sonoma Blvd to Old Glen Cove Rd Path proposed Class I Multi-Use path. The alignment in Figure VL17 does not follow the Ridge Trail alignment between Sonoma Blvd and the Carquinez Strait. This segment is a "Medium" prioritization rank. This project should be redefined consistent with Vallejo Bluff project and ranked "High" given that it is an existing ongoing project.</p>	<p>Trail alignment has been fixed, project is now represented as 730A and ranked as high priority.</p>
<p>Vallejo ATP Segments 732B, C, &amp;D would create a Class I Multi-Use Trail along the Vallejo Waterfront from the Bluff overlook to BSRA. This segment includes the Ridge Trail, SF Bay Trail, Great California Delta Trail and Carquinez Strait Scenic Loop Trail. The proposed improvements include re-routing the trail alignment along the water between Glen Cove Marina and Glen Cove Waterfront Park. These segments have a "Medium" prioritization rank.</p>	<p>Prioritization rank changed from "Medium" to "High".</p>
<p>Vallejo ATP Segment 733A Dillion Point Road is proposed as a Class III Bicycle Blvd, while Segment 100A Dillion Point Road in Benicia is a Class I Multi-Use Path. The Vallejo segment has a "Low" prioritization rank, while the Benicia portion is ranked "Medium". These two projects should be developed under the same standard and given the same priority rank.</p>	<p>Removed project 733A, kept 100A, the Class I Multi-Use Path and changed its prioritization ranking to high.</p>
<p>Vallejo ATP Segment 748C on Columbus Parkway would establish a Class IV Separated Bikeway on the segment of Ridge Trail between Lake Herman and Blue Rock Springs Park.</p>	<p>Support for plan is noted, no additional changes needed.</p>



<p style="text-align: center;">Vallejo ATP - Pg. 33, Near Term Implementation Bike Network Projects</p> <p>None of the Ridge Trail segments are included in the near-term projects as shown in Figure VL17. The Vallejo Bluff Multiuse Class I project (Ridge Trail Gap 460) should be identified in the ATP as it is currently planned and designed and given a “high” rank given that it is a current ongoing project.</p>	<p>The Ridge Trail segments are not shown in Figure VL17 because they were not identified by stakeholders in the near-term network activity for Vallejo, which is what the figure is showing. The figure is not intended to show all funded projects. The Vallejo Buff Trail project has been changed to a high ranking project in the recommended project list and has been added to the text discussion of recommended projects for near-term implementation.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Vallejo ATP - Pg. 33, Recommended Priority Pedestrian Projects.</p> <p>None of the Ridge Trail segments are included in the recommended Pedestrian Projects as shown in Figure VL-22. The Vallejo Bluff Multiuse Project should be recognized and identified as a Priority Pedestrian project.</p>	<p>Class I Multi-use Paths and associated improvements are covered under the bike lists to be in compliance with the Caltrans Class I facility designation and are not duplicated in the pedestrian section.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Unincorporated Solano County ATP - Pg. 12, Figure UN-9 Recommended Bicycle Network for Unincorporated Solano County</p> <p>The I-80/I680/Hy12 interchange Bike/Pedestrian Path in the unincorporated is not shown and addressed in the Draft Unincorporated Solano County ATP. A portion of the planned interchange bike/pedestrian improvements are in the unincorporated area. These improvements should be recognized and incorporated into the plan.</p>	<p>The alignment of the interchange path has been fixed to match the recommended alignment in for the Ridge Trail, this project is part of 371A, and is associated with the Fairfield chapter of the Plan.</p>
<p>Unincorporated Solano County ATP - The Figure UN-9 shows a Class II Bicycle Route on Green Valley Road from Rockville going north to just about the end of Green Valley road. This improvement is not shown or referred to anywhere else in the Draft ATP. Further description and rank should be provided.</p>	<p>This segment is listed in the project list, #1003B, ranked Medium priority. No additional changes made.</p>
<p>Unincorporated Solano County ATP - Proposed bike/ped improvements along Rockville Road between Rockville Hills Park and Rockville Trails Preserve are not included in the Draft ATP (RT Gap 407). This improvement is currently part of the Country’s current Capital Improvement Plan.</p>	<p>Fixed Ridge Gap Trail alignment in this area and added RT Gap 407 as a project.</p>