

Overall, I appreciate the significant effort that has gone into this long planning process, and am optimistic that this document will help guide development of our downtown towards a more walkable, bike-friendly, denser and more mixed-use core of our community.

At a high level, I have some concerns about the feasibility of implementation of the vision laid out in this plan. Many of the elements described in this vision are things the City may not have direct jurisdiction or authority over. Discussion of partners that will be necessary to realize this vision would be well-placed in this Plan, especially in discussion of implementation – what actions can be undertaken by the City, and what actions must be coordinated with outside partners?

Specific comments are listed below.

- Page xvii, the Planning Commission chair is Stephen Streeter, not Stephen Street. As of January 8, 2020, the roles of chair and vice-chair have been reversed, with Cheryl Essex chairing the commission and Stephen Streeter serving as vice-chair.
- Throughout the document, remove all uses of the phrase “alternative transportation.” (First appears on page 43.) This phrasing connotes a car-centricity that is not consistent with the values of the Davis community nor the vision outlined in the Downtown Davis Specific Plan. “Active transportation,” “bicycling, walking, and transit,” or “sustainable modes of transportation” are all better choices.
- Page 43 and 170, some places in the Plan refer to providing only minimum vehicle parking required while others discuss parking maximums. Parking maximums are the more effective policy, and these references should be revised for consistency throughout the document when discussing vehicle parking. Clarify that these policies refer specifically to parking for vehicles, as opposed to bicycle parking which should be provided in abundance.
- Page 59 and 72, the graphic for Missing Middle/Building Forms appears on both of these pages but has slightly different labels for the illustrated building types. On page 72, “townhouse” is listed twice.
- Page 65, remove the suggestion of future parking structures from this Plan. Additional parking structures have been considered by the City and community multiple times in recent years, and on every occasion have been determined to be a non-starter and a waste of valuable downtown space.
- Page 74, why is Central Park not indicated with a green asterisk as civic space on Figure 4.13?
- Page 74, Figure 4.13 includes more shades of purple, blue, and grey than are listed in the legend. In particular, there are strange diagonal changes in the grey shading of the University Ave-Rice Lane neighborhood and of purple on the block bounded by 3rd, 4th, E, and F Streets. The dark blue shading also changes colors near the western rail line at the Amtrak Station parcel, and on the Davis Commons parcel.
- Throughout the document, the restaurant patio at Bistro 33 (old City Hall, at the corner of 3rd and F Streets) is shaded on many maps as existing Public Open Space. It is a private restaurant patio—is there some arrangement for its use by the public that I’m not aware of? If so, this should be clarified in the document. If not, for consistency it should either be removed from the Public Open Space layer, or all outdoor restaurant patios should be similarly shown as Public Open Space (though I think this points to it being inappropriate to consider a private patio as public space).

- Page 154, Covell Boulevard and J Street is the first protected intersection constructed in California, but was not the first constructed in America (there was at least one in Salt Lake City that preceded it, and there may have been one in Austin, TX as well). The first bicycle signals in North America were at Russell and Sycamore, another location of the historic first bicycle lanes. In fact, the bicycle lanes on Sycamore Lane were originally configured as parking-protected lanes (what we would call Class IV today) as an experimental project, and later converted to conventional Class II lanes—another notable part of Davis’ pioneering history in bicycle infrastructure.
- Page 155, Class I facilities are not exclusive for bicyclists – they are shared with pedestrians. Class IV facilities should be referred to as “protected bikeways” not “protected bike lanes”—a deliberate distinction to avoid including them in a statutory requirement in California that bicyclists MUST use a bicycle lane if one is present.
- Page 157, “traffic stress” and “low-stress network” are mentioned a few times in the circulation discussion for bicyclists, but are never clearly defined or described (even in the glossary provided at the end of the document). Provide the appropriate context for these terms.
- Page 159, consider removing the suggestion that transit-only lanes be provided on First Street. The street is designated in the plan as transit-priority, bicycle-priority, and vehicle-priority—how is there capacity within the existing street width to accommodate all three of these and also provide a transit-only lane? This suggestion appears not to have been considered in the larger context of other Plan recommendations.
- Page 161, I strongly support the explicit statement that this Plan does not recommend any street widening or adding new streets or vehicle lanes. Thank you for including this.
- Page 181, Figure 7.4 the shading in the legend does not match the shading on the map figure. This is an issue on many figures throughout the Plan—all figures should be reviewed for color consistency between map shading and legend items. Check on screen as well as on printed documents.
- Page 183, ‘gpd’ is defined as ‘gallons per day.’ The same page includes a reference to ‘gpcd’ which is not defined. Please clarify.
- Page 196, the dots and lines on Figure 8.1 point to the wrong items in the caption/legend bar. Each line should be shifted down one item.
- Page 199, cost estimates provided in Table 8A for Class II bicycle lanes and Class IV cycle tracks of equal lengths (items 1 and 2) are the same. These facilities have different costs; specifically, Class IV facilities are more expensive than Class II because they include striping and stencils in addition to a physical barrier or raised profile.