



Minutes
Bicycling, Transportation, and Street Safety Commission (BTSSC)
July 9, 2020
5:30 p.m.

Commission Members: Joe Bolte (alternate), Timothy Csontos (Chair), Todd Edelman, Lizzy Hare, Jessica Jacobson (Vice Chair), Mick Klasson, Ayush Patel, David Soule

Council Liaisons: Brett Lee, Dan Carson (alternate)

Staff: Brian Abbanat, Senior Transportation Planner

1. Call to Order & Roll Call

Meeting was called to order at 5:30 pm

2. Approval of Agenda

Motion (Patel, Hare): Approve agenda

Motion carries: Unanimously

3. Brief Announcements from Staff and Liaisons

Jennifer Donofrio shared she is working on the League of American Bicyclists Bicycle Friendly Community application. 60- page application that includes community engagement for certification. Determining if the City can qualify for Diamond status.

Commissioner Edelman inquired if benefits result from being Platinum certification and increasing to Diamond.

Jennifer Donofrio responded that it helps for advertising our bicycle-friendly community. We would be the first to qualify for Diamond.

Councilmember Lee thanked Commissioner Bolte for BTSSC comment on DISC at City Council meeting.

Commissioner Edelman inquired about the Richards/I-80 design staff update and Caltrans design changes affect financial feasibility.

Bob Clarke responded that staff is assessing the potential cost impacts of the design changes prior to bidding to make sure the existing budget can accommodate the changes.

Commissioner Bolte commented on the Richards/Olive overcrossing, expressing interest in signage on the SB multi-use path approaching the intersection to redirect bicyclists to the South Putah Creek multi-use path.

Commissioner Edelman inquired about construction projects and review of traffic control plans. Hasn't been invited to any meetings.

Bob Clarke responded he will look into whether there are upcoming projects which will need traffic control plan review.

4. Public Comment

John Whitehead commented that a big sign is needed on westbound Cowell Blvd at Research Park Drive informing bicyclists of the South Putah Creek undercrossing.

John Hess encouraged the City to apply for Diamond status from the League of American Bicyclists. Also, W. Olive Drive, "no outlet" sign could be interpreted by bicyclists that they cannot reach the South Putah Creek Path.

John Steggall commented that the Covell at L Street reconfiguration does not make sense to me as a cycling town. Incredibly dangerous. Cyclists are squeezed when taking the travel lane.

Lauren Lee, DSHS senior working with SACOG youth leadership academy, presented on Give Me Green! technology for enabling a green light for bicyclists. Described technology and equipment needed. Can also help provide bicycling data. Cited Santa Clarita case study and awards earned. Suggested Russell Blvd & Arthur intersection as demonstration project.

Diane Swann commented on the Covell and L Street intersection. The first warning was in January 2019. Brought the issue to the BTSSC that bike lane should be restored. Covell should be restricted to one lane of travel until the intersection can be reconstructed. Bike Davis recommendation is to reduce the two EB travel lanes to one lane and extend the bike lane through the intersection. Easy to implement and reversible. Caution against City Council going against this idea. This intersection is a threat to Platinum status.

John Swann commented that south Davis signage to the South Putah Creek path is a great idea.

5. Consent Calendar

A. Approval of Minutes: June 11, 2020

Motion (Patel, Klasson): Approve minutes.

Motion carries unanimously

6. Regular Items

A. 39660 West Covell Boulevard (Bretton Woods aka West Davis Active Adult Community (WDAAC))

Brian Abbanat and Ike Njoku introduced the project and input being requested of the BTSSC on the transportation components of the project.

Brian Foster, Cunningham Engineering, representing Bretton Woods emphasized the development focuses on creating a walkable community for seniors. Described walking and

bicycling network and exhibits. Concluded the development team does not have too many differences from the staff recommendations. He shared the developer's response to Staff Report Tables 1 and 2 (indicated in the far right column of the tables below):

1

2 **Staff Report Table 1:**

ID	Comment	Current Proposal	7/9/20 PWET Staff Recommendations	7/9/20 Applicant Meeting Comments
1	Project should comply with street design standards	Applicant's proposal complies with City's standard street designs, except for the internal streets within the Cottages (Phase 3A).	Project should comply with all street design standards.	Slight modification
2	Internal paths should be wider, consistent with City multi-use path standards.	The City's multi-use path standards include a 12-foot concrete path with 2-foot shoulders on each side. Ownership of the proposed paths will not transfer to the City and are designed with 10-foot asphalt paths with no shoulders (except for the path along the Ag buffer that will be 12-foot asphalt path).	Internal private greenway paths at 10' wide are acceptable.	No exceptions
3	Project should include wider peripheral paths.	Unchanged.	Peripheral paths being dedicated to the City, or in City R/W shall meet City standard pathway design widths.	Perimeter trail as a transition zone. AC Complements nature walk trail. Cannery path is an eyesore.
4	Project should eliminate free right turns at Covell & Risling	Applicant's proposal eliminates free right turn at all intersection corners and reduces turning radius at southern intersection corners. However, the NE corner curb line remains unchanged, resulting in a longer crossing distance for bikes/peds than with the existing island and free right turn.	The NE corner should include a tighter radius.	Water tank access requires extra long tractor-trailer to access. Originally proposed tighter radii, then input from Utilites drove the larger radius. Developer I s open to revisions
5	A north/south grade separated connection across Covell is needed.	The applicant states that the separated grade crossing is not feasible, but an at-grade crossing will be provided across Covell at the intersection of Risling.	While staff believes a POC is feasible, it would be very expensive, is not necessary to support the development alone and could be pursued at a later time when the City's visions for a peripheral greenbelt/pathway system is better developed and funded. Applicant's proposal is acceptable.	No exceptions.
6	Project should include connectivity to John Jones Road and landing for future Hwy 113 crossing.	An irrevocable offer of dedication will be provided to the City for the future crossing, but the project does not provide connection across Sutter Hospital's property as Sutter has been unwilling to grant dedications.	An unimproved at grade corridor to John Jones Road utilizing the easement for the future SR-113 POC should be pursued.	Did not understand the intent of a path with no destination.

3

4 **Staff Report Table 2**

ID	Category	Staff Comment	Applicant meeting comment
1	Bike / Ped Connectivity	Pathway crossings of internal roads should consider including safety enhancements such as bulb-outs or raised crossings/speed tables.	Open to commission input.
2		A crossing of the northern boundary channel should be constructed to allow access along the dedicated land for the future SR-113 POC out to John Jones Road.	Comments similar to written response.
3		Remove proposed bollards included at John Jones intersection with north side path.	No exception to this request.
4	Street Design	Should vertical curb be used instead of rolled curb to avoid vehicles from encroaching onto sidewalks on narrow interior streets?	Prefers rolled curb due to community predominance.
5		Should on-street bike lanes continue through Shasta/Risling intersection in all directions at Covell Blvd?	Inadequate space on the SW corner to accommodate SB on-street bike lane.
6		Should bike lane exit ramps be provided at intersections?	Bus stops would put exit/on-ramps in conflict with bus stop areas.
7		Development Agreement Exhibit F and Mitigation Measure 3.14-3 (a) requires widening Risling and lengthening southbound right-turn lane from 85 to 200 feet. This does not appear to be included in plans.	No exception to this request.
8		Continue separating crosswalk pedestrian and bicycle traffic at corners by differentiating color of the concrete.	No exception to this request, had hear negative feedback from J and Covell.
9		Include bike push buttons at intersections.	No exception to this request.
10		WB Covell green conflict striping at right turn lanes (both) should be lengthened.	No exception to this request.
11		NB Shasta conflict striping should begin further south where right turn lane begins.	No exception to this request.
12		Tighten up corner radii to the maximum extent possible to shorten pedestrian crossing distances.	Have tightened to the maximum extent feasible. No exception to addition revisions.
13		Include sidewalk connection on the east side of John Jones north of Covell Boulevard.	Existing condition and no nexus to Bretton Woods project. Developer takes exception to this.
14	Remove bike box on WB Covell at John Jones.	No exception to this request.	
15	Is porkchop island necessary with raised centerline median at Delta Street intersection?	No exception to this request.	
16	General	Add additional street lighting on north side of Covell west of Risling Street.	No exception to this request.
17		Ensure sufficient freeboard between proposed multi-use path bridge floor beams and top of culvert/channel.	No exception to this request.

5

6 Regarding Table 2, Item #12, Commissioner Edelman inquired about alternative access to the
 7 water tank to allow for a smaller radius at the NE corner of Covell & Risling.

8 Brian Foster responded that the original proposal included a tighter turning radius but was
 9 enlarged to accommodate a tractor-trailer in response to Public Works' Utilities
 10 Department input.

11 Bob Clarke commented that the need for tractor-trailer access is an annual
 12 maintenance need and a rare event.

13 Brian Foster responded the developer is willing to revert to the original
14 geometry.

15
16 *Public Comment*

17 John Whitehead stated he is happy on-street bike lanes will continue through intersection.

18
19 John Steggall stated concern regarding SB lane exiting the development will not have a bike lane.

20
21 John Swann commented that no bike lane south of intersection is provided because two receiving
22 lanes are needed. WB to SB turn lanes could be reduced from two to one and make room for a
23 bike lane.

24
25 John Hess commented that existing conditions have SB bike lane on Shasta.

26
27 *Commissioner Comments*

28 Commissioner Klasson expressed support for Table 2, Item #2. Table 2 Item #9 should be sensors
29 in road and applies to left turns. Attachment 2: Off street connection should be shown on
30 Attachment 1. Also recommended the following:

31 CD's:

- 32 1. Perimeter path should have connection to Covell Blvd
- 33 2. Risling: NB bike lane should have a dashed green
- 34 3. EB Covell shared thru/right turn, creating right hook. Should eliminate the right arrow
35 from travel lane and instead merge into bike lane.
- 36 4. EB Covell bus turnout. Bike lane should be painted with green variable striping.
- 37 5. EB Covell/113 on-ramp, need green bike lane conflict markings

38
39 Commissioner Csontos commented that bike lanes need protection.

40
41 Commissioner Patel: Bicycle detection.

42 Brian Abbanat commented that the need for push button actuators for bicyclists is on the
43 bicycling facility within the protected intersection corner. On-street bicyclists will be detected
44 by the City's video detection that is mounted on the signal mastarm.

45
46 Commissioner Edelman commented that he did not support the project and it will struggle to get
47 any bicycle or transit modal share. Improvements proposed won't push Davis past Platinum
48 designation. There's nothing progressive here. Doesn't understand why the truck can enter from
49 direct south. Suggested a dynamic configuration for NE Covell/Risling corner where bollards
50 could be removed so that the large vehicle can complete the turn. Agrees with public comment re:
51 two left turn lanes onto Shasta. No current bike lanes should be removed. Reducing two WB to
52 SB Shasta to a single lane should be considered.

53

54 **B. Review of Covell and L Street Intersection**

55 Brian Abbanat introduced the item and staff report contents.

56

57 Commissioner Edelman inquired aboutu project contingency funds and whether they could be
58 applied to reconstructing the SE intersection corner.

59 Bob Clarke responded excess funds stay with the project through the end of the fiscal
60 year or unless City Council redirects it to another project. For this project, all
61 contingency funds were used on unanticipated cost increases during construction.

62

63 *Public Comment:*

64 John Whitehead criticized phrase of “redirect bicyclists” in staff report. More attention should be
65 paid to bicyclists’ right to use the road. Should be using correct terminology.

66

67 John Hess commented bike lanes should never be taken away. Decision at L Street was not the
68 best. Consider the project analogous to Fifth Street between A and B, which works fine. Urges
69 consideration for signage and painting of area to make it safer for bikes to proceed on Covell.

70

71 John Swann commented that the Davis Bike Club conducted a unanimous e-mail vote to support
72 Bike Davis proposal to fix intersection at Covell and L Street. Class II bike lanes have been there
73 for at least 45 years. Bulbout effectively removes that bike lane at an intersection. City has not
74 fixed it and has no plans to fix it. Spent three hours observing how people negotiated intersection.
75 10 in bike lane 18 in separated path. 100% of bike lane cyclists, stayed in bike lane. This is
76 predictable behavior. Bicyclists are forced into travel lane. Situation is extremely dangerous. If
77 moving fast, corrective action may not be possible. Bike lanes are closest thing to freeway for
78 bicycles. City has created a dangerous intersection and needs to be fixed as quickly as possible.

79

80 John Steggall recited comments from Dave Snyder, California Bicycle Coalition critical of the
81 design. Needs to be fixed and needs to be fixed right away. Unbelievable that this intersection
82 design was approved in the first place.

83

84 *Commission Discussion:*

85 Commissioner Bolte agrees with commenters. Intersection has a big problem. Interested in
86 possibilities for continuing bike lane through intersection. What are the possibilities for fixing the
87 intersection?

88

89 Commissioner Hare would like to understand options for remedying. Would be looking to next
90 year’s budget.

91

92 Commissioner Edelman stated it is clear what public is saying. Strongly supports Bike Davis
93 solution, but is not comfortable with it just being paint, some type of barrier or bollards are
94 needed to force cars out of the bike lane. As a second piece, supports eventually moving the light
95 pole and bulbout so the right turn lane can be allowed to continue as a bike lane. Proposes to
96 leave this on the long-range calendar for a solution that might be safer than this.

97

98 Commissioner Jacobson inquired about the options and their costs. Wanted to know how many
99 people are affected and how this prioritizes against other problematic locations in the City.

100
101 Commissioner Klasson commented that including multi-use paths, multiple vehicle lanes, and
102 bike lanes, causes problems creating very wide intersections, but thinks this intersection corner
103 needs improvement.

104
105 Councilmember Lee provided some design history. Referenced hiring Mobycon from the Dutch
106 Cycling Embassy, but their design morphed into something nobody really liked. Comments were
107 to not repeat those design decisions. Designers at L missed some opportunity for nuance. Could
108 have been designed to be more friendly for bicyclists who choose to stay on the roadway. Stated
109 he personally believes this is an unacceptable situation. Bulbout should be removed or scaled back.
110 Merging at pace into a car lane is a problem. There are ways to move people into shared spaces
111 gently and then back into a bike lane. Thinks Council would be supportive.

112
113 *Motion (Edelman, Soule): BTSSC supports:*

- 114 • *A phase 1 modification to Covell/L based on the Bike Davis recommendation with*
115 *additional physical measures to further delineate bicyclists from car traffic.*
- 116 • *A phase 2 permanent solution that considers relocating SE corner pole to enable bike*
117 *lane to continue through the intersection.*

118 *Friendly Amendment (Klasson): Support second part of the motion. Not ready to*
119 *support the first part.*

120 *Commissioner Edelman refuses friendly amendment.*

121
122 *Motion fails 1-6 (Csontos, Hare, Jacobson, Klasson, Patel, Soule dissenting).*

123
124 *Motion (Klasson, Jacobson): Recommend City Council direct staff to come up with solution that*
125 *retains a true bike lane on EB Covell through L Street intersection.*

126
127 *Motion Carries unanimously.*

128 **7. Commission and Staff Communications**

129 **A. Long Range Calendar**

130
131 Commissioner Edelman requested to see the Cannery/F street Undercrossing discussion
132 scheduled for as soon as possible. Also, Intersection Design Guidelines / Standards.

133
134 Commissioner Edelman referenced BTSSC review of 30% design was removed from LRC
135 without commission discussion. Requested Special Meeting for BTSSC to review 30% design
136 concepts.

137 Brian Abbanat responded regarding process and that the item was removed by staff
138 because the project is highly politicized and staff had scheduled the 30% design plans to
139 go directly to the community once they are ready. Staff is open to BTSSC review of 30%
140 plans after the community workshop. However, the project may be scheduled for City
141 Council prior to the September BTSSC meeting.

142
143 Councilmember Lee added that the 30% design is going to the public on July 15th. BTSSC
144 is not being excluded specifically and can weigh in on design. Council will look at 30%
145 design and support or request changes. BTSSC will have plenty of time to weigh in on
146 details.

147
148 **B. Commissioner Announcements**

149 None

150
151 **C. Subcommittee Reports / Reports On Meetings Attended / Inter-jurisdictional**
152 **Bodies / Inter-Commission Liaisons / etc.**

153 Commissioner Edelman commented that it would have helped the DISC subcommittee to have
154 had a special meeting. The Planning Commission wasn't required to see comments and the
155 BTSSC was not referred to by name. We should have exercised our power to have a Special
156 Meeting. Other commissioners put pressure on the project, though not necessarily successfully.
157 GHG emissions were not really addressed in a concrete way. Minimal alternative transportation
158 commitments.

159
160 Commissioner Bolte agreed with Commissioner Edelman's comments. Council recommended
161 that DISC go to voters for approval with some changes to transportation plans that are focused on
162 electrical shuttle to train station and UC Davis. Council did not take action on parking or housing
163 recommendations. There's a very significant gap between City Council and Davis community as
164 a whole that most GHGs are on-road transportation. We need to do a lot more work raising that
165 awareness. There are successful actions that can be taken and things that can be done. Traffic
166 equals climate change.

167
168 Commissioner Hare stated her full agreement with their concerns.

169
170 Councilmember Lee explained the distinction between baseline features versus development
171 agreement. Baseline features cannot be changed without full vote of the people. Very important
172 things will be contained in the development agreement that are not appropriate as Baseline
173 Features. The Development Impact Fees will be around \$80 million. There are going to be
174 dramatic needs for improvement infrastructure. Details are yet to be determined and not part of
175 the Baseline Features. BTSSC has a very important role and Council understands traffic has GHG
176 implications. BTSSC work wasn't wasted and wasn't ignored, Council preferred to put them into
177 Developer Agreement.

178 Commissioner Edelman responded there were many non-transportation items with detail, so it
179 was appropriate for BTSSC to raise them at this time.

180
181 **8. Adjourn**

182 *Motion (Patel, Klasson): Adjourn*

183 *Motion carries, unanimously*

184
185 *Meeting adjourned at: 8:45 pm.*