

Response to Comments

- A1. Comment noted.
- A2 (a). No, the study didn't include bike counts.
- A2 (b). Alternative 2 includes Shared Roadway markings and signs on Segment 3 (Hahman Drive to Yulupa Avenue). These markings are shown in the current version of the CA-MUTCD, page 9C-20, Figure 9C-104 (CA) and are included in this Response to Comments document. It is correct that the Shared Bike Lane would be a Shared Bike-Travel Lane, not a Shared Bike-Parking Lane. That was an error in the draft report, which will be corrected in the final version. Time-restricted lane use is not being considered.
- A2 (c). The proposed striping for Alternative 1: Bike Lanes All Segments, Appendix B Sheet 4 of 4 incorrectly shows the bike lane to the *right* of the vehicular right-turn lane. If bike lanes are installed on Sonoma Avenue, this lane would be installed to the *left* of the vehicular right-turn lane at the time of construction.
- A2 (d). Comment noted.
- A2 (e). See Figure 8, Existing Traffic Volumes, and Figure 9, Future Traffic Volumes, in the Background Report. Traffic volumes along this corridor are expected to increase significantly in the p.m. peak hour in the future. This can be seen at the three intersections at Hahman Drive, Yulupa Avenue, and Summerfield Road, as well as at Farmers Lane and Brookwood Avenue. See page 19 of the report for explanation of the source of these future traffic volumes.
- A2 (f). Comment noted.
- A3. Comment noted.
- A4. Comment noted.
- A5. Comment noted.
- A6 (a). Comment noted.
- A6 (b). See Page 1, first paragraph in Executive Summary of the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report. Additional alternatives are being developed by city staff.
- A6 (c). Comment noted.
- A7 (a). Comment noted.
- A7 (b). See Pages 6 and 24 of the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report.
- A7 (c). Comment noted; see also response to comment A7 (b).
- A7 (d). Comment noted.
- A8 (a). Comment noted.

- A8 (b). Comment noted.
- A8 (c). Comment noted.
- A8 (d). The suggestion to install a 4-inch white traffic stripe along Sonoma Avenue between Hahman Drive and Yulupa Avenue to create two 11-foot travel lanes and leave parking on the street would be is a traffic calming measure; it is not a Class II bike facility.
- A8 (e). Page 26, paragraph Alternate I, incorrectly references Figure 4; future traffic volumes are shown in Figure 9; this will be corrected in the final report.
- A8 (f). Comment noted.
- A9. Comment noted.
- A10. Comment noted.
- A11. Comments noted.
- A12. Comments noted.
- A13. Comments noted.
- A14 (a). Comment noted.
- A14 (b). See the State and Federal Standards for guidance regarding whether or not drivers believe that it is easier to have cyclists in a designated bike lane. Briefly, these standards explain that such markings can serve to increase bicyclists' confidence and can decrease motorists' uncertainty on their ability to pass a cyclist without moving toward opposing traffic.
- A14 (c). Comment noted.
- A15. Comments noted.
- A16 (a). Parking prohibitions are applicable 24 hours per day unless the prohibition is time-restricted. For example, freight loading zones, passenger loading zones, and 2-hour time limit parking spaces mean that the appropriate vehicle can park for just the amount of time noted or to unload cargo or passengers, or park elsewhere. The proposed parking prohibitions for this project are No Parking Anytime. This would include church service times. Additional alternatives are being developed by city staff.
- A16 (b). Parking does not need to be removed downtown or near the medical offices between Brookwood Avenue and Farmers Lane to install bike lanes; the width currently allocated for the additional through lanes would instead be used for the bike lanes. The parking removal is proposed only at locations where the street is too narrow to install bike lanes and maintain minimum width travel lanes. Additional alternatives are being developed by city staff.

A17 (a, b, c, d, e, f). Figure 6 shows the 55-foot wide segment of Sonoma Avenue between Summerfield Road and Carley Road. *Alternative 1* includes two 10-foot travel lanes and a 10-foot center turn lane in this segment, which would be less than the 11-foot minimum lane width requested for transit bus operations. In comparison, this segment currently has through lanes and center turn lane that are between 12 and 15 feet in width. With *Alternative 2* the existing 12-foot travel lanes would be retained, but the center turn lane eliminated in order to accommodate the proposed bike lanes. See Table 7 and the sentence following on Page 25 of the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report. The elimination of the left-turn lane would not cause a significant impact. The benefit of selecting *Alternative 2* over *Alternative 1* is the improved efficiency of transit operations. This was unknown at the time the report was written.

Figure 5 shows the narrower segment of Sonoma Avenue from Yulupa Avenue to Carley Road; it is 46 feet wide curb-to-curb. Both through lanes and the center turn lane are 10 feet wide with two 8-foot parking lanes. Because the through lanes are already less than transit's preferred 11-foot minimum lane width, neither *Alternative 1* nor *Alternative 2* results in a deterioration from existing conditions. If parking is to be maintained at its current 8-foot width, then the turn lane would need to be eliminated and the 10-foot travel lanes maintained. This is shown in Figure 5 as *Alternative 1*.

One alternative that was not considered in the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report is to reduce the parking lane widths to 7 feet wide in Segment 4 (Yulupa Avenue to Carley Road). This would allow for increasing the through lanes from 10 to 11 feet, and maintain standard-width bike lanes. There are other options noted by the commenter, including installing bike lanes in a phased approach starting with Segments 1 and 2 at this time and adding Segments 3, 4 and 5 in the future. Additional alternatives are being developed by city staff.

All other comments noted.

B1 (a). Comment noted.

B1 (b). Comments are noted.

B2. Comments noted.

B3 (5 numbered comments). Comments noted.

B4. The *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report indicates the estimated impact that the proposed bike lanes would be expected to have on Sonoma Avenue traffic congestion and/or traffic capacity. Table 13 in the report indicates that the under future conditions the intersection of Sonoma Avenue and Farmers Lane would operate the same as existing conditions with or without the project in both the AM and PM peak periods.

All other comments noted.

B5 (a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j). The suggestion is noted regarding an additional alternative to be investigated relative to the proposed parking prohibition on one side of Sonoma Avenue along Segment 3, Hahman Drive to Yulupa Avenue. Rather than removing parking either on the north side or the south side, as indicated in the project recommended

alternative, *Alternative 1*, the suggestion is to remove the parking in a chicane-style, removing some parking on each side of the street intermittently. This suggestion noted that that this eliminates the need for residents to cross the street to access their parked vehicle. Additional alternatives are being developed by city staff including chicane-style parking between Hahman Drive and Yulupa Avenue.

This is a more elaborate alternative than was considered as part of the project analysis. However, the project does not preclude such a suggested alternative.

The suggestion to install left-turn lanes at Edgemont and Franquette is noted, though not feasible if standard-width bike lanes are to be installed within the existing narrow width of Sonoma Avenue between Hahman Drive and Yulupa Avenue. See *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report Appendices A and B for detailed drawings of traffic striping.

Regarding the suggestion to install pedestrian refuge islands at transit stops, the project does not preclude such installations. However, communications with City of Santa Rosa Fire Department staff indicate that concrete medians would be expected to compromise their response-time goals.

All other comments noted.

- B6. The existing center turn lane between Yulupa Avenue and Carley Road, including along the Herbert Slater Middle School street frontage, would be eliminated. The impact on turning movements and the signalized intersections and corridor traffic flow was analyzed for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours only, not the midday or school drop-off or pick-up periods. The evaluation indicates that eliminating this center turn lane would not cause a significant impact on traffic. See the project report, Page 25, for details of this evaluation. See the entire report, especially Figure 6 and Appendices A and B, for existing lane geometry and proposed lane changes. City staff is working with Herbert Middle School to address their concerns related to traffic circulation during the morning drop off and afternoon pick up.
- B7. See responses to comments A2 and B5 above. All other comments noted.
- C1 (a). See *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report, Pages 4 and 5, including Tables 1 and 2.
- C1 (b, c, d, e). Comments noted.
- C2 (a, b). Some segments of Sonoma Avenue currently have center turn lanes and some segments do not. Some segments of Sonoma Avenue currently have 10-foot wide travel lanes with center turn lanes; other segments have 12-foot wide travel lanes with and without center turn lanes. Some travel lanes are proposed to be narrowed in order to accommodate two bike lanes. In Segment 3, between Hahman Drive and Yulupa Avenue, the existing travel lanes are 12 feet wide, with on-street parking permitted. With Alternative 1 the 12-foot travel lanes would be maintained and half of the parking removed. As proposed, Alternative 2 narrows the travel lanes but maintains parking. Note that Alternative 2 was shown incorrectly in Figure 4 of the report. The final version of the report will show the correct version with 13-foot travel lanes proposed

as Shared Bike & Travel Lanes, and maintain the existing 8-foot parking lanes. Additional alternatives are being developed by city staff.

There is no segment where it is proposed to decrease the width of the travel lanes *and* also remove parking lanes.

- C2 (c) For information on peak parking times, see the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report, Page 6, Parking Demand Methodology. Peak parking demands and related studies are focused on normal peak demands, not parking demands during special events, including holidays.
- C2 (d). Comment noted.
- C2 (e). On September 24, 2007, the City sent a notice to those who attended the Community meetings. It is also posted at the following web site address: <http://ci.santa-rosa.ca.us/default.aspx?PageId=129>. The notice included a project update and schedule with a tentative date for council decision on November 13, 2007.
- C2 (f, g). The project report did not include bicycle counts. See Page 24 of the project report for information on the proposed parking prohibition and mention of anticipated mid-block street crossings related to this change.
- C2 (h). The City Council is responsible for decision-making regarding the various project issues, including where, if any, parking prohibitions would occur.
- C2 (i). Montgomery Village was notified of the project; other comment noted.
- C3 (a). In 2003, Hoen Avenue was converted from four lane roadway to a two lane roadway with a center two way left turn lane and bicycle lanes. A follow up study was conducted by the City. Contact the Department of Public Works Traffic Engineering for the results of the study.
- C3 (b, c). Comments noted.
- C4. All comments noted.
- C5. All comments noted.
- C6. All comments noted.
- C7 (a, b, c, d). Comments noted. Regarding data on bicycle-related collisions, such data is collected by the State of California. City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department staff can be contacted for detailed inquiries regarding for bicycle-related crashes on Sonoma Avenue, for example. This data was not evaluated as part of this project. See the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report for additional background information.
- C8. There is no proposal to do a bicycle count; other comment noted.
- C9. There are warrants to determine if the volume of right turns warrants a separate right-turn lane. The signalized intersections along Sonoma Avenue were analyzed with their

existing configurations and with the various alternative configurations. The impacts in terms of changes in delay per vehicle at each signal are summarized and found in Tables 13 and 14 of the project report. In brief, eliminating the westbound right turn lane at E Street will increase the average delay by less than one second in the p.m. peak hour and not at all in the a.m. peak hour. The road is insufficiently wide to add bike lanes *and* maintain this right turn lane. Regarding Brookwood Avenue, there is insufficient width to add a turn lane without otherwise eliminating a through lane or left-turn lane. All other comments noted.

- C10 (a). Yes, however the city will evaluate a bicycle only phase from Howarth Park to Sonoma Avenue as part of a more detailed signal design at Summerfield Road and Sonoma Avenue.
- C10 (b). See response to comment A17 above related to transit operations.
- C11. All comments noted. Installing pedestrian islands was not considered. Though the project does not preclude such installations, communications with City of Santa Rosa Fire Department staff indicate that concrete medians would be expected to compromise their response-time goals.
- C12. City Council is responsible for decisions on the project alternatives.
- C13. Comment noted.
- D1. See the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report, including some of the conclusions on Page 36 noting changes in LOS at various study intersections and segments, and Tables 13 and 14 for details. The report explains details related to the intent of the project in the Background Section beginning on Page 2. The purpose is to install bike lanes, not improve vehicle traffic operations. All other comments noted.
- D2. Comments noted.
- D3 (a). Cost estimate unknown.
- D3 (b). City would seek out grant funding.
- D3(c). No study has been conducted however based on the average daily traffic and comparable city streets it does not appear that this is a significant impact.
- D3(d). Unknown. Bicycle counts are being conducted as part of the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan update.
- D3(e). No The *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report and Initial Study constitute the required environmental study.
- D3(f). Due to traffic calming benefits and interests in implementing the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.
- D3(g). None. The proposed improvements would be considered as part of the proposed General Plan amendment.

- D3(h). City is working with the Herbert Slater Middle School to discuss their concerns related to the bike lane alternatives and related impacts to school pick-up and drop-off activities.
- D3(i). No
- D3 (h, i, j). The project report notes that this project will cause an average of five seconds of additional delay at the traffic signal at Yulupa Avenue if configured per Alternative 2 (removing the westbound left turn lane). However, Alternative 1 would be expected to cause no increase in the a.m. peak period delay over the existing condition, and only a 0.1 second increase in delay in the p.m. peak. See the project report Table 13 for more details.
- The City Council is responsible for making the decision on the project.
- D4. See response to comment A6 (b).
- D5 (a). See Page 24 of the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report for parking data collection and analysis information. In addition, Page 6 of this report explains the parking survey methodology.
- D5 (b). The City of Santa Rosa has adopted standards for roadway facilities. Design and Construction Standard 200-1 requires a minimum width of five feet for a bike lane. Narrower bike lanes have been installed in Santa Rosa, though installation of sub-standard roadway facilities is not preferred.
- D6. Comment noted.
- D7. The City Council has the decision-making authority on this project. Interested parties will be informed of the date, time, and place for future meetings and hearings. Input from the community is included in the information they use to make this decision, including these public workshop comments, and all other comments received during the public comment period, as well as comments they receive at their meeting.
- D8. No changes to the Herbert Slater Middle School drop-off and pick-up zone on Carley Road are proposed. All project alternatives maintain existing parking along the school's street frontage. See the project report, especially Appendices A and B for details on the existing and proposed traffic striping.
- D9. The *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report references the City's current General Plan, *Santa Rosa 2020: General Plan*, adopted in 2002.
- D10. Comments noted. City is working with the Herbert Slater Middle School to discuss their concerns related to the bike lane alternatives and related impacts to school pick-up and drop-off activities. If reference is to moving the location of where the school busses stop, then it would be a school decision.
- D11. Vehicles were counted, not estimated, for this traffic study. The *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report includes an evaluation of the capacity of the seven study segments along the Sonoma Avenue corridor. The Level of Service (LOS) criteria was achieved for six of the seven segments under all project alternatives with existing traffic

volumes. Segment 2, Farmers Lane to Hahman Drive would be expected to deteriorate from an existing LOS E to LOS F in the p.m. peak hour. This means that the vehicular traffic would be expected to continue using Sonoma Avenue with the project without a significant increase in delay. Table 14 in the project report summarizes this data.

- D12. The safety of bicyclists is the primary purpose of this project, and the bike lane project is expected to increase their traffic safety, not diminish it. The typical collisions involving bicyclists do not occur due to vehicles moving quickly out the way of an oncoming emergency response vehicle (police or fire). Typical bicycle collisions occur under more common traffic operations.
- D13. Comment noted.
- D14. See Page 24, especially the last paragraph, of the *Sonoma Avenue Bike Lane Improvement Project* report.
- D15-21. Comments noted.
- D22. See response to comment A14 (b).
- D23. Yes, while the bus is stopped. Other comments noted.
- D24. Comments noted.
- D25. Comments noted.
- D26. Comments noted. See response to Comment C7.
- D27. Comment noted.
- D28. Comments noted. See Response to comment D11. Bike lanes are proposed to increase bicycle safety. The lanes are created by installation of 6-inch longitudinal striping adjacent to travel lanes, parking lanes, or both. Similar markings, such as 4-inch stripes, are occasionally installed to reduce travel speeds. These markings also delineate the edge of travel ways. These markings are similar and therefore, bike lanes can also result in reducing travel speeds. Narrower lanes also impact travel speeds; speeds are usually lower in 10-foot lanes than in 12-foot lanes.
- D29. Comments noted.
- D30. To provide input on the re-striping of Montgomery Drive, you can contact the City of Santa Rosa Public Works Department, Traffic Engineering staff. The department general telephone number is 707-543-3800.
- D31. Comments noted.
- D32. Comments noted.
- D33. Comments noted. In preparing the traffic study it was assumed that the project must fit into the existing roadway width, and the question whether trees would need to be removed in order to widen the road to install bike lanes is outside the scope of this project.

- D34. Comments noted.
- D35. Comments noted. See Response to comment D33 above for additional information.
- D36. Comments noted.
- D37. See response to comment A6 (b).
- D38. Comments noted. See also response to Comment D5 (b).
- D39. See response to comment A6 (b).
- D40. Comment noted.
- D41. Comment noted.
- D42. Speed limits are set in accordance with the provisions of the *California Vehicle Code*.
- D43. See Response to comment D38 above.
- D44. Comments noted, and all comments will be provided to the Santa Rosa City Council prior to their project-related decisions.
- D45. Comments noted.
- D46. Comment noted.