



1 **Minutes**
2 **Bicycling, Transportation, and Street Safety Commission (BTSSC)**
3 **February 10, 2022**
4 **5:30 p.m.**

5
6 Commissioners: Debapriya Chakraborty, Timothy Csontos (Chair), Lizzy Griffith,
7 Jessica Jacobson (Vice Chair), Krasen Kovachev, Brook Ostrom
8
9 Council Liaisons: Josh Chapman, Gloria Partida (alternate)
10
11 Staff: Brian Abbanat, Senior Transportation Planner (Liaison)
12 Bob Clarke, PWET Director
13 Dianna Jensen, City Engineer
14 Jennifer Donofrio, Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator
15 Joseph Garcia-Long, Associate Civil Engineer
16
17 Absent: Commissioner Csontos, Councilmember Partida
18

19
20 **1. Call to Order & Roll Call**

21 Meeting called to order at 5:32 pm
22

23 **2. Approval of Agenda**

24 Brian Abbanat requested to withdraw Agenda Item 6C and reschedule to another
25 meeting.

26 *Motion (Ostrom, Griffith): Approve agenda with modification.*

27 *Motion carries: 4-0*
28

29 **3. Brief Announcements from Staff and Liaisons**

30 No announcements from staff or City Council liaison.
31

32 **4. Public Comment**

33 Todd Edelman hopes City Council can get new people on the commission. Referenced
34 a hearing for proposed car wash at Mace & Cowell and the project should be seen by
35 the BTSSC. Project has impacts on Mace Blvd and Pioneer Elementary School. No
36 outreach has been conducted to anyone, including Pioneer Elementary. Wants
37 commission to ask for update on plans for East Olive Drive in relation to the new Pole
38 Line Road / Olive Drive connector. Council has promised complimentary measures.
39 Wants this to be addressed.

40 Susan (last name unclear) is very concerned about proposed modifications to Mace
41 BLVD do not go far enough to correct problems. Referenced personal bicycle crash in
42 August 2019 with multiple compound fracture. Filed claim that was denied by the City.

43 Current proposal does not address inherent damages of raised concrete. Consider
44 removing tracks and concrete triangles.

45
46 **5. Consent Calendar**

47 *Motion (Chakraborty, Kovachev): Approve consent calendar*

48 *Motion carries, 5-0.*

49
50 **6. Regular Items**

51 **A. BTSSC Leadership Elections**

52 Jessica Jacobson self-nominated for Chair

53

54 Nominations were made for Brook Ostrom, Tim Csontos

55

56 *Public Comment:*

57 Todd Edelman doesn't understand why going forward with election when new people
58 will be joining. Seems unkosher.

59

60 *Commission Discussion:*

61 *Motion (Griffith, Ostrom): Jacobson as chair*

62 *Motion carries, unanimously.*

63

64 *Motion (Kovachev, Griffith): Commissioner Ostrom as Vice-Chair*

65 *Motion carries, 5-0.*

66

67 **B. Feedback on Mace Blvd Redesign Concepts**

68 Dianna Jensen introduced the topic. Adrian Engel, Fehr & Peers, also attended. Key
69 slides include:

- 70 • Project Goals
- 71 • Cross Sections
- 72 • Plan View Exhibits
- 73 • Next Steps

74

75 Commissioner Ostrom inquired about pre-project vs. post project traffic counts.

76 Adrian Engel responded they're primarily looking at afternoon peak traffic. Traffic
77 surveys indicate 150-200 additional peak hour trips on NB Mace at end of week
78 when freeway congestion was getting worse.

79

80 *Public Comment:*

81 Todd Edelman commented he doesn't understand project phasing. Stated the County
82 has dropped the ball with some kind of Agricultural vehicle alternative road. Reducing

83 cycling space, people will continue to ride bi-directionally. Narrowness will increase
84 danger. People shouldn't have to cross the boulevard twice, they're going to ride
85 counterflow. Physically protected bike lanes are a good thing, bad design contributed to
86 public commenter's injury. Plan for a car wash at NE corner of Cowell & Mace. City staff
87 & Council is pushing forward car wash despite the functional connection to this project.
88

89 Andy Furrillo referenced shooting incident on Mace/I-80 interchange. Increasing
90 capacity will decrease safety on Mace. City has proposed testing signals south of
91 Montgomery. If that works, funding should be redirected to transit and other
92 transportation needs.
93

94 Tara (last name unclear): Agreed with Susan, public commenter. Inquired about traffic
95 congestion impacts without two southbound lanes south of El Macero. Stated that
96 previous meetings of County and neighbors had a good solution. City is refusing
97 because of cost. Referenced Garamendi saying funding will be given to Davis to fix
98 some of the Mace Blvd problems.

99 Adrian Engel responded the southbound lane change is a condition that exists
100 today, we're just moving it further south. Capacity doesn't change.
101

102 Susan (last name unclear): Appreciates lane changes, but not hearing anything about
103 the concrete medians being removed. Referenced letter to editor. Sees kids every
104 morning, they're not in the track, they're in the sidewalks. Cyclists everyday ignore the
105 track. Doesn't get why you aren't addressing getting rid of the tracks.
106

107 *Commission Discussion:*

108 Commissioner Ostrom stated he lives in the general vicinity and bikes Mace Blvd to
109 Tremont 3-4 times/week. There were problems in past with two northbound lanes at
110 Mace & Cowell due to left lane leapfrogging back into right lane. Concern is restoring
111 the second lane will simply create more queueing capacity, increasing the amount of
112 traffic. Challenge is how to prevent cars from lane jumping after Cowell.

113 Adrian Engel responded that condition exists today north of Cowell. That will
114 happen further south. His team took into account that condition in their prior
115 traffic modeling. With the additional northbound lane, access for local residents is
116 significantly better. Len jumping is more of an enforcement issue and may
117 happen sometimes.
118

119 Commissioner Ostrom asked if two northbound lanes would encourage more traffic.

120 Adrian Engel responded that absolutely can happen. However, implementing the
121 traffic signal simultaneously and metering traffic flow will mitigate against some of
122 that and create platoon breaks so the neighborhood can access the street.
123

124 Commissioner Ostrom asked why the City is constructing improvements before traffic
125 signal pilot.

126 Dianna Jensen responded the community has been living with conditions and
127 there is a desire to see some changes now. Moving forward with one project of
128 meaningful scope. Believes there's value in either scenario.

129
130 Commissioner Ostrom asked why the two-way cycle track idea on the west side was
131 dropped and the reasoning behind the second southbound lane.

132 Adrian Engel responded the two-way cycle track was dropped to make
133 accommodations for second southbound lane. The second southbound lane
134 wasn't an absolute necessity, but because of issues with farm vehicles and
135 emergency services unable to go around traffic, that second lane has a lot of
136 value.

137
138 Councilmember Chapman stated there was strong agreement that the pilot light project
139 would coincide with second northbound lane opening to ensure it doesn't fill with traffic.

140
141 Commissioner Ostrom asked what Davis residents were involved in Yolo County
142 working group.

143 Dianna Jensen responded it was a self-established group of Yolo County
144 residents that live in the area. They have been communicating mainly with the
145 County, so likely mostly from El Macero. Also, some residents south of El
146 Macero.

147
148 Commissioner Ostrom asked about the "future consideration" of a right turn lane at
149 Cowell Blvd

150 Adrian Engel responded that traffic will be monitored during phase 1. Turn lane
151 would not be channelized and would require reconstruction of bike lane. Fehr &
152 Peers does not see a lot of benefit, because through lane would back up blocking
153 the turn lane.

154
155 Commissioner Ostrom commented that the project still has a lot of unanswered
156 questions. Still don't have any traffic counts. There is a lot of money, an enormous
157 investment to make a change that may affect our ability to make transportation
158 investments in the City. Should solidify some of these issues before moving to
159 construction.

160
161 *Motion (Ostrom, Chakraborty): Recommend City Council return this to a representative*
162 *group of Davis residents and bicycle and transportation organizations to review*
163 *recommendations and work done with additional clarification or recommendations to*
164 *date and come forward to the City Council.*

165
166 *Friendly amendment #1 (Chakraborty, accepted by Ostrom): Come back with*
167 *some data for a basis of decision making.*

168
169 *Friendly amendment #2 (Jacobson, accepted by Ostrom): Include key*
170 *performance indicators for success to be evaluated against each goal.*

171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213

Motion carries: 5-0.

C. Presentation on ROAM Smart Lock / Bicycle Theft Reduction Pilot Project

Item withdrawn and deferred to later meeting.

D. 2021 Citywide Speed Survey Results

Bob Clarke introduced the item. Decided to bring as informational item to make commission aware of legal changes related to establishing speed limits. Explained existing hierarchy of California Vehicle Code statutes regarding establishing speed limits. Referenced new state law that moves the needle back to where we were legislatively 10-15 years ago. Options are limited. Physical changes then have to be followed up with surveys to see if they've slowed speeds. PD is interested in seeing streets posted with legal speed limits so they can enforce. Judges frown on cities with speed traps. But raising speed limits is inconsistent with community values.

Commissioner Jacobson asked what police enforcement resources could be committed if speed limits were compliant.

Bob Clarke responded he doesn't have an answer to that right now, but when we return next time for commission action, could have a PD representative to speak to that topic.

Public comment:

Todd Edelman: If speed limits are raised, there may be more ticketing with a limited number of police to do that, but more danger. City Council approved repaving plan without BTSSC review and resulting in too wide streets. Physical narrowing is required. Can you implement something before repaving starts again. Russell Blvd concept doesn't have physical barriers for on-street bicycle facilities and widens the road to the west. City and UC Davis don't seem to have the same strategy for bicycle speed limits. Streets don't accommodate higher speed e-bikes. People need to be convinced to put money into infrastructure that will slow people down, that's what works.

Jeff Bruchez: Is there any speed studies on these corridors? Any ideal results of this item tonight, law enforcement or better, safer infrastructure? Davis should have an interest in law and leg given our proximity to the Capitol.

Commission Discussion:

Commissioner Jacobson commented she believes driver non-compliance is quite high. Has never seen enforcement on B Street since she's been living here. Agrees drivers are going significantly higher than posted limits. Stated a prior City she lived in and

214 recently visited, has a lot of enforcement. What do we know about the actual speeds
215 and the real ability of the PD to enforce if they are compliant?

216 Bob Clarke responded all non-blue street segments (on exhibit) have speed survey
217 data within the last 6 months. All red segments exceed posted speed limits. Expects
218 to return to commission on a citywide basis. Challenge is that speed surveys are
219 required to be conducted during “free flowing” conditions, which can cause variability
220 in surveys depending on which hour of the day the survey was taken. Preference
221 would be to find physical improvements to roadways at slower speeds. But that
222 takes an investment in time and money. Some streets we should make the effort
223 because they were intended for four lane roads but are not being used that way. Will
224 be coming back to the commission in the next couple of months, potentially in
225 batches.

227 **7. Commission and Staff Communications**

228 **A. Long Range Calendar**

229 Brian Abbanat reviewed upcoming long-range calendar items and potential shifting.

230

231 *Public Comment:*

232 Todd Edelman: Olive Drive complimentary measures. Also, planned car wash for Mace
233 and Cowell should be formally part of the Mace Blvd project and BTSSC should look at
234 potential impacts. Transportation Codes, Regulations, etc. could guide the Reimagine
235 Russell project. Should establish a subcommittee for the Green Waste item.

236

237 **B. Commissioner Announcements**

238 Brian Abbanat announced tonight will be his last BTSSC meeting as he has accepted a
239 Senior Planner position with the Yolo County Transportation District.

240 Bob Clarke added that staff will send a follow-up e-mail to BTSSC regarding
241 transition of BTSSC responsibilities.

242

243 **C. Subcommittee Reports / Reports On Meetings Attended / Inter- 244 jurisdictional Bodies / Inter-Commission Liaisons / etc.**

245 Commissioner Kovachev stated he is getting up to speed on the Climate Action and
246 Adaptation plan as the BTSSC liaison.

247

248 **8. Adjourn**

249 *Motion (Ostrom, Kovachev): Adjourn*

250 *Motion carries, unanimously*

251

252 Meeting adjourned at: 7:45 p.m.