

San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 10600, San Francisco, California 94102 tel 415 352 3600 fax 415 352 3606

September 28, 2018

TO: Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Committee Members

FROM: Steve Goldbeck, Chief Deputy Director (415/352-3611, steve.goldbeck@bcdc.ca.gov)
Shannon Fiala, Planning Manager (415/352-3665, shannon.fiala@bcdc.ca.gov)
Clesi Bennett, Coastal Planner (415/352-3613, clesi.bennett@bcdc.ca.gov)

SUBJECT: Background Material for Discussion of Public Access and Environmental Justice at BCDC's Environmental Justice Commissioner Working Group Meeting on October 4, 2018

Public Access Discussion

On October 4, 2018, BCDC staff will present on BCDC Public Access requirements and lead a discussion on how to incorporate environmental justice and social equity into BCDC's Bay Plan public access policies. For your information, staff has provided the following materials:

1. Sections of the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan pertaining to public access.
2. BCDC's Public Access Guidelines: Shoreline Spaces (attached as separate PDF).
3. BCDC's Public Access Guidelines: Shoreline Signs (attached as separate PDF).
4. Portions of the California Coastal Commission's and draft environmental justice policy.
5. Portions of the California State Lands Commission's draft environmental justice policy.
6. Portions of the Environmental Justice Working Group's Recommendations for the State Lands Commission's Environmental Justice Policy Update.
7. Portions of the City of Richmond's Health and Wellness Element of the Richmond General Plan 2030: pg. 11.16-21, 33-34.
8. Portions of the City of Vallejo's environmental justice objectives of the Propel Vallejo General Plan 2040: pg. 7.17-18.

Questions for the Working Group to Consider

1. What can BCDC learn from other policy examples? How could BCDC's existing policies be amended? Or are there new policies that could be created?
2. Is BCDC's permit process too late in the project design / entitlement process?
3. How can BCDC balance its role as a regional agency with the needs of communities as we attempt to create equitable public access?
4. How could BCDC's Design Review Board and Public Access Design Guidelines incorporate EJ and equity into public access design?

1. Sections of the McAteer-Petris Act and the San Francisco Bay Plan pertaining to public access

The McAteer-Petris Act

66602. Findings and Declarations as to Necessity for Providing Locations for Water-Oriented Land Uses and Increased Public Access to Shoreline and Waters.

The Legislature further finds and declares that certain water-oriented land uses along the bay shoreline are essential to the public welfare of the bay area, and that these uses include ports, water-related industries, airports, wildlife refuges, water-oriented recreation and public assembly, desalinization plants, upland dredged material disposal sites, and powerplants requiring large amounts of water for cooling purposes; that the San Francisco Bay Plan should make provision for adequate and suitable locations for all these uses, thereby minimizing the necessity for future bay fill to create new sites for these uses; that existing public access to the shoreline and waters of the San Francisco Bay is inadequate and that maximum feasible public access, consistent with a proposed project, should be provided.

66632.4. Permits for Projects Within Shoreline Band Located Outside Boundaries of Water-Oriented Priority Land Uses.

Within any portion or portions of the shoreline band that are located outside the boundaries of water-oriented priority land uses, as fixed and established pursuant to Section 66611, the commission may deny an application for a permit for a proposed project only on the grounds that the project fails to provide maximum feasible public access, consistent with the proposed project, to the bay and its shoreline. When considering whether a project provides maximum feasible public access in areas of sensitive habitat, including tidal marshlands and mudflats, the commission shall, after consultation with the Department of Fish and Game, and using the best available scientific evidence, determine whether the access is compatible with wildlife protection in the bay.

San Francisco Bay Plan - Public Access Findings and Policies

- a. San Francisco Bay is a dominant feature of the nine-county Bay Area and affords a variety of habitats for many diverse plant and wildlife populations. It provides an environment for numerous forms of public enjoyment including viewing, photography, wildlife observation, nature study, fishing, wading, walking, bicycling, jogging, or just sitting beside the water. As an outstanding visual resource, the Bay is an important focal point for the entire region that serves to orient people to its various parts.
- b. Access to the Bay allows the public to discover, experience and appreciate the Bay's natural resources and can foster public support for Bay resource protection, including habitat acquisition and restoration. Public access can provide for recreational activities, educational and interpretive opportunities, and means for alternative transportation.
- c. Public access required by the Commission is an integral component of development and usually consists of pedestrian and other nonmotorized access to and along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. It may include certain improvements, such as paving, landscaping, and street furniture; and it may allow for additional uses, such as bicycling, fishing,

picnicking, nature education, etc. Visual access to the Bay is a critical part of public access. In projects that cannot provide on-site public access due to safety or use conflicts, including significant adverse effects on wildlife, in lieu public access may be appropriate.

- d. The Commission has adopted advisory "Public Access Design Guidelines" to assist in the siting and design of public access to San Francisco Bay. The Design Review Board was formed in 1970 of professional designers to advise the Commission on the adequacy of public access of proposed projects in accordance with the Bay Plan.
- e. Although public access to the approximately 1,000-mile Bay shoreline has increased significantly since the adoption of the Bay Plan in 1968, demand for additional public access to the Bay continues due to a growing Bay Area population and the desirability of shoreline access areas. Diverse public access experiences are in great demand, both along urban waterfronts and in more natural areas. The full potential for access to the Bay has by no means yet been reached.
- f. Accelerated flooding from sea level rise and storm activity will severely impact existing shoreline public access, resulting in temporary or permanent closures. Periodic and consistent flooding would increase damage to public access areas, which can then require additional fill to repair, raise maintenance costs, and cause greater disturbance and displacement of the site's natural resources. Risks to public health and safety from sea level rise and shoreline flooding may require new shoreline protection to be installed or existing shoreline protection to be modified, which may impede physical and visual access to the Bay.
- g. Public agencies have contributed to improved Bay access by providing a substantial number of parks and recreation areas. In addition, many agencies and communities continue to examine the waterfronts in their jurisdictions and have proposed new points of public access to the Bay. However, other demands for governmental services will necessarily limit funds for the provision of shoreline access by these agencies. Clearly, additional public access to the Bay is needed, and this can be provided, in part at least, by private capital in a wide variety of shoreline developments.
- h. Although opportunities for views of the Bay from public access areas have increased since the Bay Plan was adopted in 1968, there are still a significant number of shoreline areas where there exists little or no visual access to the Bay.
- i. Public access areas obtained through the permit process are most utilized if they provide physical access, provide connections to public rights-of-way, are related to adjacent uses, are designed, improved and maintained clearly to indicate their public character, and provide visual access to the Bay. Flooding from sea level rise and storm activity increases the difficulty of designing public access areas (e.g., connecting new public access that is set at a higher elevation or located farther inland than existing public access areas).

- j. In some cases, certain uses may unduly conflict with accompanying public access. For example, unmanaged or inappropriately located public access may adversely affect wildlife or some port or water-related industrial activities may pose a substantial hazard to public access users.
- k. Insufficient knowledge on the specific type and severity of effects of human activities on wildlife creates a need for more scientific studies, both in the San Francisco Bay Area and elsewhere in similar habitats with similar human activities. More baseline data are needed for comparison purposes and to help isolate disturbance factors (e.g., disturbances caused by human activities versus other factors such as poor water quality or natural variability).
- l. Studies indicate that public access may have immediate effects on wildlife (including flushing, increased stress, interrupted foraging, or nest abandonment) and may result in adverse long- term population and species effects. Although some wildlife may adapt to human presence, not all species or individuals may adapt equally, and adaptation may leave some wildlife more vulnerable to harmful human interactions such as harassment or poaching. The type and severity of effects, if any, on wildlife depend on many factors, including physical site configuration, species present, and the nature of the human activity. Accurate characterization of current and future site, habitat and wildlife conditions, and of likely human activities, would provide information critical to understanding potential effects on wildlife.
- m. Potential adverse effects on wildlife from public access may be avoided or minimized by siting, designing and managing public access to reduce or prevent adverse human and wildlife interactions. Managing human use of the area may include adequately maintaining improvements, periodic closure of access areas, pet restrictions such as leash requirements, and prohibition of public access in areas where other strategies are insufficient to avoid adverse effects. Properly sited and/or designed public access can avoid habitat fragmentation and limit predator access routes to wildlife areas. In some cases, public access adjacent to sensitive wildlife areas may be set back from the shoreline a greater distance because buffers may be needed to avoid or minimize human disturbance of wildlife. Appropriate siting, design and management strategies depend on the environmental characteristics of the site, the likely human uses of the site, and the potential impacts of future climate change.
- n. Providing diverse and satisfying public access opportunities can reduce the creation of informal access routes to decrease interaction between humans and wildlife, habitat fragmentation, and vegetation trampling and erosion. Formal public access also provides for more predictable human actions, which may increase the ability of wildlife to adjust to human use.
 - 1. A proposed fill project should increase public access to the Bay to the maximum extent feasible, in accordance with the policies for Public Access to the Bay.

2. In addition to the public access to the Bay provided by waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers, maximum feasible access to and along the waterfront and on any permitted fills should be provided in and through every new development in the Bay or on the shoreline, whether it be for housing, industry, port, airport, public facility, wildlife area, or other use, except in cases where public access would be clearly inconsistent with the project because of public safety considerations or significant use conflicts, including unavoidable, significant adverse effects on Bay natural resources. In these cases, in lieu access at another location preferably near the project should be provided.
3. Public access to some natural areas should be provided to permit study and enjoyment of these areas. However, some wildlife are sensitive to human intrusion. For this reason, projects in such areas should be carefully evaluated in consultation with appropriate agencies to determine the appropriate location and type of access to be provided.
4. Public access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife. To the extent necessary to understand the potential effects of public access on wildlife, information on the species and habitats of a proposed project site should be provided, and the likely human use of the access area analyzed. In determining the potential for significant adverse effects (such as impacts on endangered species, impacts on breeding and foraging areas, or fragmentation of wildlife corridors), site specific information provided by the project applicant, the best available scientific evidence, and expert advice should be used. In addition, the determination of significant adverse effects may also be considered within a regional context. Siting, design and management strategies should be employed to avoid or minimize adverse effects on wildlife, informed by the advisory principles in the Public Access Design Guidelines. If significant adverse effects cannot be avoided or reduced to a level below significance through siting, design and management strategies, then in lieu public access should be provided, consistent with the project and providing public access benefits equivalent to those that would have been achieved from on-site access. Where appropriate, effects of public access on wildlife should be monitored over time to determine whether revisions of management strategies are needed.
5. Public access should be sited, designed, managed and maintained to avoid significant adverse impacts from sea level rise and shoreline flooding.
6. Whenever public access to the Bay is provided as a condition of development, on fill or on the shoreline, the access should be permanently guaranteed. This should be done wherever appropriate by requiring dedication of fee title or easements at no cost to the public, in the same manner that streets, park sites, and school sites are dedicated to the public as part of the subdivision process in cities and counties. Any public access provided as a condition of development should either be required to remain viable in the event of future sea level rise or flooding, or equivalent access consistent with the project should be provided nearby.

7. Public access improvements provided as a condition of any approval should be consistent with the project and the physical environment, including protection of Bay natural resources, such as aquatic life, wildlife and plant communities, and provide for the public's safety and convenience. The improvements should be designed and built to encourage diverse Bay-related activities and movement to and along the shoreline, should permit barrier free access for persons with disabilities to the maximum feasible extent, should include an ongoing maintenance program, and should be identified with appropriate signs.
8. In some areas, a small amount of fill may be allowed if the fill is necessary and is the minimum absolutely required to develop the project in accordance with the Commission's public access requirements.
9. Access to and along the waterfront should be provided by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means and connect to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available. Diverse and interesting public access experiences should be provided which would encourage users to remain in the designated access areas to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects on wildlife and their habitat.
10. Roads near the edge of the water should be designed as scenic parkways for slow-moving, principally recreational traffic. The roadway and right-of-way design should maintain and enhance visual access for the traveler, discourage through traffic, and provide for safe, separated, and improved physical access to and along the shore. Public transit use and connections to the shoreline should be encouraged where appropriate.
11. Federal, state, regional, and local jurisdictions, special districts, and the Commission should cooperate to provide appropriately sited, designed and managed public access, especially to link the entire series of shoreline parks, regional trail systems (such as the San Francisco Bay Trail) and existing public access areas to the extent feasible without additional Bay filling and without significant adverse effects on Bay natural resources. State, regional, and local agencies that approve projects should assure that provisions for public access to and along the shoreline are included as conditions of approval and that the access is consistent with the Commission's requirements and guidelines.
12. The Public Access Design Guidelines should be used as a guide to siting and designing public access consistent with a proposed project. The Design Review Board should advise the Commission regarding the adequacy of the public access proposed.
13. Public access should be integrated early in the planning and design of Bay habitat restoration projects to maximize public access opportunities and to avoid significant adverse effects on wildlife.

14. The Commission should continue to support and encourage expansion of scientific information on the effects of public access on wildlife and the potential of siting, design and management to avoid or minimize impacts. Furthermore, the Commission should, in cooperation with other appropriate agencies and organizations, determine the location of sensitive habitats in San Francisco Bay and use this information in the siting, design and management of public access along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. *Amended October 2011.*

2. BCDC's Public Access Guidelines: Shoreline Spaces (see attached as separate PDF)

3. BCDC's Public Access Guidelines: Shoreline Signs (see attached as separate PDF)

4. Portions of the California Coastal Commission's and Draft Environmental Justice Policy

Th[e Environmental Justice] Policy Statement is designed to achieve more meaningful engagement, equitable process, effective communication, and stronger coastal protection benefits that are accessible to everyone, and incorporates and is further implemented by the following Statement of Principles:

Coastal Access. The Commission reaffirms its long-standing commitment to protecting, providing, and maximizing public access for all the people. The coast belongs to everyone, and cannot be denied or diminished on the basis of race, ethnicity, socio-economic status, or place of residence. The Commission realizes that the conversion of lower-cost visitor-serving facilities to high-cost facilities is a barrier to access for those with limited income, and contributes to increased coastal inequality. The Commission will continue to strive for a no-net-loss of lowercost facilities in the coastal zone, while implementing a longer-term strategy to increase the number and variety of new lower-cost opportunities.

Understanding that even nominal costs can become insurmountable barriers to access for vulnerable populations and underserved communities, the Commission confirms that preserving and providing for lower-cost recreational facilities is also an environmental justice imperative. This includes recreational opportunities such as parks, trails, surf spots, beach barbecue and fire pits, safe swimming beaches, fishing piers, campgrounds, and associated free or low-cost parking areas.

5. Portions of the California State Lands Commission's Draft Environmental Justice Policy

Environmental Justice Vision and Objectives

Increase and Encourage Equitable Public Access. Preserve, protect, and expand public access to Public Trust lands and resources by supporting, facilitating and encouraging projects that increase public access to these lands and resources for disadvantaged, marginalized, and vulnerable communities that have traditionally not been able to enjoy them.

a. Embrace partnerships with state agencies, Tribes, local jurisdictions, and organizations for projects and other efforts which:

- (1) Protect, conserve and restore natural resources, cultural resources, and wildlife habitat.
- (2) Increase and enhance trail and recreational amenity construction, habitat restoration, open space parks, and beach access.

6. Portions of the Environmental Justice Working Group's Recommendations for the State Lands Commission's Environmental Justice Policy Update

Public Access and Conservation. Privatization, pollution, environmental destruction, and mismanagement are ongoing problems that prevent public access to natural lands and waters. As a result, many indigenous peoples are denied access and rights to their ancestral lands. Low-income communities of color lack sufficient access to open space, especially on the coast and near waterways. SLC needs to identify ways to reduce pollution on these lands and waters, integrate a cultural understanding of how indigenous and communities of color interact with these places, and engage communities not traditionally included in coastal planning.

- a. Support Native people's ability to engage in cultural activities on their homelands and engage with traditional cultural practitioners in development of conservation and invasive species control plans.
- b. Conserve coasts, oceans, and inland waterways, including using expanded cultural perspectives of how Native Americans and communities of color traditionally use or enjoy these natural resources. Challenge narrow racial views of acceptable uses of these areas.
- c. Restore coastal, marine, and freshwater ecosystems, including in and near low-income communities of color.
- d. Encourage blue carbon projects (like seagrass bed restoration) near EJ communities to sequester carbon or mitigate and offset pollution. Locate beneficial marine projects adjacent EJ communities.
- e. Increase access for EJ communities and the public to river corridors, including the San Joaquin River. Encourage conservancy boards and other government entities to do the same.
- f. Actively encourage public access to the state's natural areas especially for disadvantaged communities that live nearby but haven't traditionally been able to enjoy them.
- g. Enhance the quality of life of residents living in EJ communities through safer and improved public access, in conjunction with wildlife habitat restoration projects across the state. Work with coastal management agencies to promote construction of public access trails, signs, and related facilities on public lands, and to ensure communities have access to interpretive materials and special outreach events about pollution prevention, wildlife habitat, public access, and flood protection.

Waterfront Development. Coastal development and riverfront properties such as luxury hotels and homes, look like exclusive enclaves for affluent White communities. A 21st-century understanding of the scope and goals of the public trust requires revisiting policies that facilitate this type of development, and instead ensuring a more diverse set of uses to benefit the diverse communities of our state. We would see Native American, Black, Latino, Asian immigrant and low-income folks living on and using these lands, whether built as affordable housing or as open space. Within its jurisdiction and influence, SLC should correct its course on this history of discrimination in waterfront development.

- a. Ensure that waterfront development projects benefit disadvantaged communities.
- b. Deny approval for development projects that negatively impact EJ communities and ensure that local governments administering granted lands do the same.
- c. Promote development projects that clean up and revitalize EJ communities and move away from toxic land uses.
- d. Develop and implement waterfront development policies that support affordable housing, beach access, and parks for communities such as Wilmington that exist in the shadow of multiple industrial facilities.

7. Portions of the City of Richmond’s Health and Wellness Element of the Richmond General Plan 2030: pg. 11.16-21, 33-34

GOAL HW1 Improved Access to Parks, Recreation and Open Space

Improve access to a variety of high-quality, well-activated parks and recreational opportunities for all residents. Locate resources and programming that support a range of activities close to neighborhoods. Provide opportunities for increased physical activity and social interaction by providing well-maintained playgrounds, parks and open space provide.

GOAL HW4 Safe and Convenient Public Transit and Active Circulation Options

Support access to adequate and safe public transit and active circulation options that increase physical activity, reduce air and noise pollution and make streets safe for people of all ages. upward mobility in the community.

Policy HW1.1 An Integrated System of Parks, Plazas, Playgrounds and Open Space

Provide a comprehensive and integrated system of parks, plazas, playgrounds, trails and open space. The community’s current and future needs for quality outdoor space can be met by improving existing parks, creating linear greenways in established neighborhoods, and creating new parks, plazas and open space in new developments. A comprehensive, integrated system should include parks, playgrounds, community greens, greenways and trails. Ensure adequate maintenance of these facilities to encourage safe and active use.

Policy HW1.2 Diverse Range of Park Types and Functions

Continue to provide a diverse range of park types, functions and recreational opportunities to meet the physical and social needs of the community. Regularly review the design and programming of all City parks to expand and diversify uses.

Policy HW1.3 Recreation Programs and Services

Expand and tailor recreational programs and services to meet evolving community needs. Programs and services should remain accessible and relevant to today's residents, responding to unique cultural, historic and social needs as well as changing demographics.

Policy HW1.4 Quality Recreational Facilities

Provide a range of quality recreational facilities that are well maintained, have adequate lighting, signage, hours of operation and represent the multi-ethnic and multicultural needs of the community. Providing facility upgrades may increase capacity to attract people from neighborhoods that are currently underserved.

Policy HW1.5 Joint-Use Opportunities

Promote access to non-City operated parks and recreational facilities. Existing resources operated by the East Bay Regional Parks District, school district, community groups or others may support residents' interim needs for convenient access to parks and community centers. Joint-use opportunities serve to more efficiently utilize existing facilities and amenities, host programs in convenient neighborhood locations, better activate community areas so that they are in use during the day and in the evenings and enable the City and partners to share the cost of maintenance, upgrades and improvements for the benefit of the entire community.

Policy HW1.6 Safe Public Spaces and Facilities

Protect visitors of parks and recreational facilities from exposure to structural and safety hazards, wildland fires, crime and other natural or human-induced incidents and promote park and facility design that discourages vandalism, deters crime, provides natural surveillance and creates a safe and comfortable environment. Improving public safety can be accomplished by appropriately designing parks, trails and recreation facilities, and by providing safe outdoor play structures and equipment in City-owned and operated facilities. Ensure fire safety in areas adjacent to open spaces prone to wild fires.

Policy HW1.7 Access to Large-Scale Natural Areas

Improve access to large-scale natural areas located in the City including regional parks along the shoreline and in the hills. These areas should be open for controlled access to improve public enjoyment and interpretation. Access should be limited where natural habitat is extremely sensitive. Work with transit agencies to improve connections and access to open space and recreation facilities from all Richmond neighborhoods.

Policy HW1.8 Shoreline Access and Development

Enhance public access to and encourage development of sports and recreation activities along the Richmond's shoreline to encourage environmental awareness and improve public health and fitness. Encourage the development of sports and recreation activities along Richmond's waterfront.

Policy HW1.9 Equitable Distribution of Park and Recreation Facilities

Expand park and recreation opportunities in all neighborhoods and ensure that they are offered within comfortable walking distance of homes, schools and businesses in order to encourage more physically and socially active lifestyles. Continue to implement the parkland development standard of three acres of community or neighborhood parkland per 1,000 population in each neighborhood planning area. This represents a minimum provision which should be exceeded whenever possible. In established neighborhoods where land availability for new large parks is limited, prioritize improvement and maintenance of compact parks, play lots and plazas to increase access to recreation opportunities for residents.

Action HW4.A Community Access and Mobility Criteria

Develop access and mobility criteria for capital improvement projects and new development to enhance physical access to community facilities, schools, parks, shoreline open spaces, historical destinations, commercial and employment centers and transit hubs. The criteria should address access by walking, bicycling and public transit as well as vehicular access. The community access and mobility criteria should:

- Ensure safe connections to large and small open spaces, community facilities such as schools, community centers, recreational facilities, cultural and enrichment centers, historical destinations, transit hubs and commercial and employment centers;
- Address travel routes, infrastructure improvement needs and barriers such as roads, railroad lines, highways, fences and natural features; and
- Provide bicycle and pedestrian-friendly routes including completion of major trails and pathways like the San Francisco Bay Trail and Richmond Greenway.

Action HW4.D Bicycle and Pedestrian Plans

Develop and implement citywide bicycle and pedestrian plans to make Richmond a more pedestrian and bicycle-friendly City. Identify gaps in the network, major travel routes and priority safety improvements. Designate a network of multi-use trails and off-street paths. Include connections to open space amenities such as Point Isabel, San Francisco Bay Trail, Point San Pablo, Point Pinole and the Richmond Greenway. Update design guidelines and standards for bicycle and pedestrian facilities and amenities that meet local, state and federal standards.

Include a uniform citywide signage plan and comply with all Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. Explore the potential to designate pedestrian priority areas or districts. Include strong connections to the downtown, recreation destinations, commercial and mixed-use streets, transit stations and schools. Address pedestrian and bicycle connections in parking lots. Collaborate with Contra Costa County and other jurisdictions to ensure links to the regional trail network including the San Francisco Bay Trail and coordination with the County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Coordinate efforts with ongoing bicycle and pedestrian community initiatives.

Action HW4.E Bicycle, Pedestrian, and Trail Standards

Develop standards for bicycle, pedestrian, and trail improvements and amenities in new development and redevelopment projects. Include requirements for adequate, safe and accessible bicycle parking, drinking fountains, public restrooms, benches, landscaping and lighting. Require new development and redevelopment projects to be pedestrian and bicycle-friendly, and to provide adequate connections to the existing and proposed bicycle and pedestrian network. Require all new commercial, industrial and residential development to provide access for construction and operation of a trail where a local or regional trail is designated or planned. Include provisions that require owners of property along the shoreline to provide maximum feasible public access to the shoreline and to complete the Bay Trail as part of any project approval process.

8. Portions of the City of Vallejo’s environmental justice objectives of the Propel Vallejo General Plan 2040: pg. 7.17-18

Policy CP-1.4 Active Recreation Facilities. Ensure all Vallejo residents are served by convenient and safe active recreation facilities that meet the needs of all ages, abilities, and interest groups.

Action CP-1.4A. Include active recreation opportunities for a range of ages and interests as considerations in planning and projects for the central waterfront and shoreline areas.

Action CP-1.4B. Assess on an on-going basis the safety of existing recreational facilities in Vallejo by mapping crime in areas near existing facilities and identify measures to increase safety.

Action CP-1.4C. Explore opportunities for providing access to safe places for recreational in-water activities, such as boating, kayaking, paddle boarding, and swimming.

Action CP-1.4D. Support GVRD and the Florence Douglas Senior Center in exploring the need for a multi-generational center that will provide opportunities for education, physical exercise, and other active living programs.

Action CP-1.4E. Promote community “ownership” of active recreation facilities by establishing programs that encourage local residents and neighborhood organizations to "adopt," protect, and maintain parks, open spaces, and trails.

Policy CP-1.5. Active Recreation Programming. Support and expand active recreation programs in Vallejo.

Action CP-1.5A. Support the Greater Vallejo Recreation District, residents, and community partners to assess the need for recreation programs and services and develop a strategy for addressing those needs.

Action CP-1.5B. Work with local community groups and the Solano County Public Health Department to initiate walking, hiking, cycling, and other recreation clubs and activities to increase participation, safety, and social cohesion.

Policy CP-1.6. Active Transportation Network. Promote the health benefits of walking and bicycling by providing a convenient and safe network of bicycle paths and routes, sidewalks, pedestrian paths, and trails, including connections with major destinations such as civic facilities, educational institutions, employment centers, shopping, and recreation areas.

Action CP-1.6A. Identify problem locations in Vallejo regarding pedestrian/auto and bicycle/auto collisions, identify measures (e.g., traffic calming, improved street lighting) to reduce collisions, and develop a prioritized program for implementing identified measures.

Action CP-1.6B. Support and expand Vallejo’s Safe Routes to Schools program in collaboration with the VCUSD, Vallejo Police Department, Solano Public Health and Solano Transportation Authority (STA).

Action CP-1.6C. Encourage school siting decisions that take safe walking and bicycling access into account.

Action CP-1.6D. Develop guidelines for public and private projects that promote safe, convenient, and attractive bike and pedestrian facilities, including amenities to enhance bike and pedestrian activity, such as bicycle racks, lockers, street trees, public art, and street furniture.

Action CP-1.6E. Seek resources to increase police presence in and around bike and walking paths and pedestrian areas, through means such as, reintroducing bike patrols by the Vallejo Police Department and re-establishing police substations in key areas.

Action CP-1.6F. Work with neighborhood watch groups to improve safety for bicyclists and pedestrians and to increase the use of active transportation.

Action CP-1.6G. Develop a “safe routes for seniors” program in collaboration with seniors organizations.

Policy CP-1.7. Green Space. Promote community physical and mental health through provision and preservation of the urban forest, natural areas, and “green” infrastructure (i.e., best practices water management).

Action CP-1.7B. Regularly maintain the health of City street trees.

Action CP-1.7C. Support efforts by stewardship agencies to preserve wetland and open space areas.

Action CP-1.7D. Work with partners, including the Solano County Public Health Department, universities, and other groups to develop and maintain maps that illustrate access to green spaces within Vallejo neighborhoods.

Action CP-1.7E. Continue to implement green infrastructure practices that draw upon natural processes to address storm water drainage and flood control and potentially, add to Vallejo’s network of green spaces.