

**CITY OF SANTA ROSA
BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ADVISORY BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
May 20, 2010
Minutes**

1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Member Stanley called the meeting to order at 4:05 pm.

Present: Members Adams, Brown, Dadko, Jones, Moulton, Stanley

Absent: Chair Klassen, Vice Chair Frye, Members Rhodes

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There was not a voting majority in attendance at the May meeting to approve the April minutes.

3. COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS

Comments from the public are noted under each specific agenda item. Non-agenda items appear under item 6.

4. STATEMENTS OF ABSTENTION BY BOARD MEMBERS

None.

5. REPORT ITEMS

5.1 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (BPMP) Update; and Board Comments

Fabian Favila, Transit Department, said this was another opportunity for Board members to discuss the preliminary chapters of the BPMP among themselves and with staff and ask any related questions. Fabian also provided updated information on topics discussed in the April meeting and clarified the process for incorporating Board comments into the process and schedule.

Fabian provided updates on two topics discussed in April: Bicycle Boxes and Bicycle Boulevards. He informed the Board that the California Traffic Control Devices Committee (CTCDC) voted 7-1 not to allow Caltrans District 5 to experiment with Bicycle Boxes and that instead the District 5 consider applying to the Federal Highway Administration for permission to experiment.

Fabian also distributed an outline of Chapter 6 to the preliminary BPMP for discussion with the Board.

Fabian clarified why the bicycle boulevard was discussed in April and his review of the Fundamentals of Bicycle Boulevard Planning & Design guidebook that Board member Frye made available to Board members. The topic was discussed because the update to the BPMP removes Jennings Avenue as a bicycle boulevard and instead proposes a Class III bike route. Board member Moulton requested the Board discuss the issue. Fabian provided page 2 and 5 of the guidebook which provides the definition of bicycle boulevard and discussion of grid pattern road networks, a characteristic of bicycle boulevards. In reference to Board member Frye's April comment that not all of the bicycle boulevards in the guidebook case studies use diverters, Fabian said in his cursory review he found at least four of the

case studies included diverters, another characteristic of bicycle boulevard. Fabian provided aerial maps of bicycle boulevards in Palo Alto and Berkeley demonstrating that both are in grid pattern streets. Fabian said that from the discussions with the Board and the exchange of information that it appears Jennings Avenue does not meet the characteristics of a bicycle boulevard and it would still be staff's recommendation that it not be proposed as such and that he would advise Council that Jennings Avenue would be a challenging street. However, he emphasized that Jennings Avenue should be a bikeway. If the Board still wanted to advise Council that it felt Jennings Avenue should be a bicycle boulevard he would carry that message forward. He said it was important to have an informative discussion and exchange of information now.

Fabian expressed his concern about diluting the design of what a bicycle boulevard is emphasizing that bicycle boulevards are great when designed correctly. He shared a photo of a "bicycle boulevard" in Mountain View that has no diverters, no traffic circles, no pavement markings and is on a transit route, which he said defeats the purpose of a bicycle boulevard. He also noted the intersections has 4-way stops instead of 2-way stops favoring the bicycle boulevard as a through movement, all features that make a street a bicycle boulevard, but that are lacking in the Mountain View example. He said this is what he is trying to avoid in design and planning.

He noted that in the April meeting he heard a theme in the comments made by board members and the public about the importance of Jennings Avenue being a bicycle boulevard to encourage the use of bikes, to note that bikes belong, and bikes have priority. He said this sounds more like encouragement for a modal shift and that there other areas that encourage people to make the mode shift to bicycles: the City's Transportation Demand Management Program (Transit), Safety and Education (Police) Street Smarts (Public Works) and Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition (Street Skills course). Safe Routes to School is another education awareness program Public Works does and the Bicycle Coalition is involved in that encourage the mode shift. Fabian emphasized Jennings Avenue is a planning and design issue.

Fabian then explained the Board could make a list of areas of interest or advisory comments regarding the BPMP. Staff would review the topics on that list with the Board to have an informative discussion and share information why staff would or would not recommend it. Once discussed, the Board's comments would be shared with the Council as part of staff's presentation and staff report. He emphasized that comments being received by the Board are being tracked. Those that staff has no issues will be incorporated in the final to save costs and facilitate release of the draft.

All other comments from the Board will be incorporated or discussed as part of staff's report and presentation to Council as well as the Planning Commission's.

Fabian handed out Chair Klassen's initial list of advisory items. He noted that some items on the list may not be items for all members on the Board, and that Board members may add to the list for later vote. However it was important that each individual Board member understand the issues. Fabian reviewed Klassen's initial list of advisory items: 1) Jennings Avenue discussed in April and May meetings, 2) Wilson Street Class II staff made presentation to Board last year on staff's recommendation, 3) Class III Network has been added as one of the priority projects; it has merit, 4) Alderbrook was discussed in a prior Board meeting where it was noted by staff and some Board as a difficult intersection, 5) Brigham has been added

to the map and detailed project list, 6) 4th connection—Fabian reminded the Board that the High Priority Pedestrian list is more of a sidewalk infill list rather than a pedestrian connection list and that chapter 1 discusses a prior study that recommended the 4th Street connection and that the Downtown Station Area Specific Plan (DSASP) documents the City's desire to connect through the mall should there be any future construction

Board member Jones asked about installing a traffic light at Alderbrook (Item #4) to facilitate crossing. Fabian said it would have to be studied with Traffic Engineer. Rob Sprinkle, Traffic Engineering, said Public Works would probably look at something other than a traffic signal. Jones asked about a traffic signal at Talbot Avenue instead. Rob Sprinkle said a prior review indicated Talbot Avenue did not meet the warrants for a traffic signal but did for a pedestrian flasher, but he would have to review the study from three years ago to be sure.

Board member Stanley said that in his separate discussions with Board members Frye and Klassen that they felt the 4th Street connection should be in the BPMP. Stanley said that if the 4th street connection were in the priority list, it would reinforce the DSASP. Fabian said that he could see adding it to the pedestrian priority list via the BPAB advisory list indicating staff had no issues.

Board member Stanley said from what he read in the minutes he would support Jennings Avenue as a bicycle boulevard. He also asked how a strong east-west and north-south connection could be developed if Jennings Avenue does not meet the characteristics for a Bicycle Boulevard according to staff. Stanley said Jennings seems like a good opportunity other than the intersection at Marlow and what were the criteria that if it doesn't meet the grid system it doesn't meet the criteria? Fabian emphasized that the recommendation is that Jennings Avenue still be a bikeway and reminded the board that in last month's discussion he spoke how bicyclist would be facilitated in crossing the Marlow and Dutton and that currently there is video detection at Marlow. He summarized the characteristics (criteria) of a bicycle boulevard: diverters, availability of alternative routes, local street versus a transitional (collector) street, cross street, and land use (traffic generators) as some of the characteristics to consider

Again he said it does not mean that Jennings Avenue should not be a bikeway; it should, and street treatments considered in those areas where special attention is needed (e.g. intersection crossings, narrow travel lanes). Fabian said he cares about having a good bicycle boulevard that is designed and signed correctly and operates correctly. He said that Jennings Avenue would be a challenging street (as a bicycle boulevard). Stanley asked if he would recommend an alternative route and Fabian said not in this area and directed the Board to p.5 of the guidebook (shared by Board member Frye) that reads: "Development of bicycle boulevards in suburban or rural settings can often be challenging due to a lack of alternate through roadways..." Fabian acknowledged that Jennings is can be an alternative for some bicyclist to College Avenue of Guerneville Road and that it is important, which is why Jennings Avenue still remains proposed as a bikeway. Board member Jones asked for clarification on traffic volume for bicycle boulevards. Fabian said the number used is 2500, but the challenge with Jennings is that there are two peaks that occur twice a day at two different locations because of the two schools and there are no alternative streets to direct traffic to. However the remainder of the street seems to be low volume as mentioned in the prior meeting. Jones said her concern is that the

majority of Santa Rosa streets are suburban, dead end with loops delivers a blow to bicycle boulevards and it is more challenging but feels we need to come up with something. Board member Moulton said that what seems to be the challenge is how to design Jennings so that a variety of bicyclist can feel safe and use it comfortably and this may require making it less optimal for motorist. Board member Dadko asked for clarification what would happen next with all the comments being made. Fabian said that if the Board feels that Jennings should still be a bicycle boulevard it can add this to its advisory list, and it would be incorporated in to the staff report and presentation to Council for decision. However, based on all information reviewed, it is still staff's recommendation to propose Jennings as a bikeway, specifically a Class III-Bike Route. Fabian emphasized that what is important is that there is an exchange of information and informative discussion. Dadko said that even though Jennings is not on a grid, she does not think it is impossible. Board member Adams asked what the Board is physically recommending on Jennings if it is to be a bicycle boulevard. Fabian said that Chapter 6 will identify a variety of street treatments to use on a bicycle boulevard, but which treatments would be determined at the project specific level. Fabian also noted where the street treatments are placed is critical to the success of a bicycle boulevard as well

Board member Stanley asked about the red boxes that previously appeared on the bicycle map and whether they would appear in the final. Fabian said they are still there and instead of appearing on the map now appear in the bicycle project list. This is so staff or developers do not rely on the map alone but delve further into the bicycle network and view the detail of the routes and the policies in chapter 1. Board member Brown asked about the speed bumps in Humboldt Street. Nancy Adams, from Public Works, said it would present survey results at the June meeting.

Stanley asked about the schedule for the release of next version of the BPMP draft. Fabian said it now looks like July 1st because the draft environmental review submitted by the consultant still needs more work according the Department of Community Development. Fabian said the Board is pretty well informed about what is in the BPMP based on the preliminary draft that was made available in December 2009 and that not much has changed in that content except in Chapter 5. Fabian added the Council directed review section, which discusses 6th Street, Wilson Street and Zoning Code proposal for bicycle parking, which was discussed and made available to the Board last month for comments and feedback. In previous meetings Wilson and 6th Streets were discussed with Board as well.

Stanley also wanted to clarify that the reference in Klassen's list that no parking would be available at the downtown SMART station is not accurate because the recent release of SMART's station plans shows parking at all of its stations now.

Moulton said she was worried about the Humboldt bike boulevard in its unintended state and was wondering how to move the process along maybe through a subcommittee. Fabian said that it is important that the intended outcome of such a subcommittee be clear as well as the duration of the subcommittee and that Public Works should be consulted. Stanley noted another consideration is staff resources and something Chair Klassen may consider as a follow up with Public Works.

Dadko asked how to give feedback on the Chapter 6 outline. Fabian said it is still being developed and when the next version is released the Board can provide comments at that time. She felt that Safe Routes to School may also fit under the education and awareness category. Fabian said the purpose of Chapter 6 is to list

best practices and future topics that should be explored in the next update. Dadko also asked about the Southeast Greenway being discussed by Bennett Valley neighborhood association. Fabian said this is identified as Route 310 and runs from Hoen to Summerfield. The route wasn't extended beyond Summerfield at this time because of its crossing proximity to a signalized intersection and park access control issue since it would terminate at Spring Lake outside of the designated parking openings. She also asked how bicycle facilities in the unincorporated area would be built once annexed by the City. Fabian said he coordinated with the county on the master plan and in addition that it is recommended that the BPMP be reviewed annually. This would be another opportunity to update the map with any changes (e.g. recently annexed lands, completed projects –proposed to existing). He reminded the Board that in January/February Public Works shares its Work Plan so this would be another opportunity.

Member Moulton asked about Vallejo Street, Brigham Avenue, Gordon Lane on the map and suggested there be an additional Class III on Cooper as an alternative to Brookwood when traveling from the south side of the Fairgrounds headed north.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Christine Culver: said that city of Sebastopol made some of its bicycle facilities contingent by noting they were dependent on a feasibility study. She fears that if not in the bicycle plan those bicycle facilities will never be constructed. Ms. Culver also stated that the Class I bike lanes through the greenway should be in the plan.

6. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA MATTERS

7. CHAIR/BOARD MEMBERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Member Moulton will not be attending the June meeting.

Member Brown wanted to mention the walkabouts. She is on a team that performs walkabouts and structured negotiations. One of the recent walkabouts identified a couple of hazardous intersections for pedestrians – Mission Boulevard and Highway 12, and Hoen Avenue at Farmers Lane. They are on a Caltrans list of intersections to improve due to the team's negotiations.

8. STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Member Stanley will need to leave today's meeting at 5:30pm.

Transit Department Staff Fabian Favila will not be attending the June meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT OF REGULAR MEETING

Hearing no further business, Member Stanley adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.