

Attachment 8 - Planning Commissioner Duggan's Comments

GENERAL:

1. The Plan needs to include specific, measurable, quantifiable goals that are evaluated on a regular basis:
 - a. Plan Goals should include statements such as “x miles of protected bike facilities will be built within x years, bikes as transportation share should be at x percent by 2025, x percent of schoolchildren will be walking or biking to school by 2025, the number of men and women bicycling for transportation will be split 50-50 by 2025 and maintenance of the bike facilities will be prioritized and bicycle detour routes will be clearly marked in locations where detours for cars are noted”.
2. The 2018 plan update needs to include information noting how many miles of bicycle infrastructure called for in the 2010 plan has been created. There appears to be little correlation/reference between this update and the adopted 2010 plan. There is no clarity on which projects included in this update are being carried forward from the 2010 plan and if they're being prioritized for completion in the first phase of this plan build out.
3. I fully support the plan's goal for the city to hire a dedicated Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator who works on bike and ped issues full time. I think that this is imperative for cities with Bicycle Friendly status from the League of American Bicyclists who are seeking to improve their rating, and also, as mentioned earlier, if we're serious about meeting our VMT reduction goals.
4. I fully support the idea to encourage the city to adopt a Vision Zero policy to reduce deaths caused by traffic crashes.
5. Santa Rosa right now has many examples of poorly executed bike “infrastructure” – Class II bike lanes that end without warning and no signage for motorists or cyclists that the lane is about to end, lanes that are discontinuous, or lead into dedicated turn lanes, requiring people on bikes to make risky lane changes if they want to continue straight through intersections (First street eastbound between B and Santa Rosa Ave as an example), car right turn lane pockets at signalized intersections that are striped as through bike lanes (North Street southbound at Pacific, Third Street eastbound at B street, Stony Point northbound at West Third street as examples), that set up bike riders and car drivers for negative interactions, should the driver want to make a right turn on the red light. (Note: I have never seen this treatment in any publication of bicycle infrastructure and don't believe that it is standard anywhere but here). I think that we need to have a policy, especially where bike lanes end on busy streets to install signs at these locations to notify car drivers to expect bicyclists in the travel lane.

SPECIFIC COMMENTS:

1. Attachment #1 (packet, not plan), Recommended Bikeways: are all of the on street improvements for both sides of the streets indicated?
2. Attachment #5 (packet, not plan), First Phase Projects: Study item BB – Class II bike lanes currently exist between West Third Street and Guerneville Road on Stony Point. Why is this segment being studied?
3. Attachment #6 (packet, not plan), Table 6-4 Studies: Are all the listed Studies for bike improvements or pedestrian improvements or both? Can it be made more clear in the table as to what exactly is going to be studied?
4. Attachment #8 (packet, not plan), GPA Text Redline: What's the criteria to determine which bikeway treatment a particular location receives? The text should also include a note that Class I bike paths should be of a pre-determined minimum width in areas where there's an expectation of heavy pedestrian use, due to the speed discrepancies between bicyclists and pedestrians.

PLAN COMMENTS:

5. The Plan should include a mechanism for maintenance and review of existing infrastructure to make sure that it is still clear and legible and that the bike way treatment is still applicable for the conditions, especially if it's a treatment, like a Bicycle Boulevard or Class IV bikeway that is only installed in a single location.
6. Page 8: Climate Action Plan: How are we doing to meet the goal of greenhouse gas emission reduction of 25% by 2020?
7. Page 9: Under General Plan 2040: What's the mechanism to test the success of achieving the goal of 5% of all trips and 10% of trips 5 miles or shorter are made by non-motorized means by 2020? Since that's only one year out, do we have any idea how close we are to achieving this goal?
8. Page 14: Goals #1 & 3: Performance measures: where are we currently with all of these goals?
9. Page 18-19: Policy #4: Propose to add action to evaluate signalized intersections to add crosswalks at all four legs and eliminate situations where pedestrians are required to cross two streets to get to their destination. Policy #9, Action 9.1: Strike the language, "If additional internal support is required..." from the action to establish a full time pedestrian and bicycle coordinator.
10. Page 47, Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons: Is there any plan to add any of these in locations with high speed, high traffic volume (such as at Benton St crossing Mendocino Ave and Glenn St crossing College Ave)?
11. Pages 54 and 56: The information on these pages seem to indicate that most bicycle related collisions are the fault of the rider while most pedestrian related collisions are the fault of the motorist. Is this correct?
12. Page 60: Are the majority of the proposed Phase 1 improvements going to be concentrated in the three areas shown on Figure 3-21 with the highest rate of injuries (Stony Point, Glenbrook to Sebastopol Rd, Mendocino, Elliott to 10th street and Steele Lane/Guerneville, Humboldt to the SMART train)?

13. Also, I'd like to see Chapter 3 include information regarding Pedestrian levels of stress along corridors with insufficient sidewalks or crossings of multi lane roads with no pedestrian refuge islands.
14. Page 86, Figure 5-2: The Class I bike path shown on the map along Santa Rosa Creek under City Hall. How realistic is it to include this in this plan? Also 1st Street between B Street and Santa Rosa Ave: There used to be a Class II bike lane on the south side of the street. When the street was repaved and restriped and a second, southbound turn lane was added, the bike lane was not restored. Can this be added back into the plan?
15. Page 87, Figure 5-3: What is the reason for installing the first proposed Class IV along Sebastopol Road? Does the traffic volume and traffic speed here require this? Wouldn't this kind of treatment be more suited to a higher speed corridor such as Mendocino Ave between College Ave and the city limits?
16. Page 92, Figure 5-7 Pedestrian projects, Citywide: What does "study" mean for pedestrian projects? Study the feasibility of a project or the need for or both of these things?
17. Page 94, Figure 5-7 Pedestrian projects, Northwest (same number as above, please check): I'd like to see two added projects to this map – one an enhanced crossing with a beacon at Chanate and Lomitas – it's the Humboldt Bike Boulevard route to the County Center and is a difficult and dangerous crossing for bicyclists and pedestrians, and the other a study to see if a HAWK type beacon is warranted at Glenn Street and College Ave.
18. Page 96, Figure 5-9: Why is a segment of the Roseland Creek Trail noted for a study and not a future Class I trail that would connect the existing Class I to the proposed Class I segment?
19. Page 113 Bike Parking: Would like to see information included here or in the appendix with dimensioned sketches for installing bike racks adjacent to building walls, adjacent bike racks and other obstructions.
20. Page 133 Tables 6-1 and 6-2: It's disappointing that of all the proposed improvements included in this plan, the short-term bicycle improvements only amount to about 10 miles worth of infrastructure and only 10 of 39 pedestrian enhancements are foreseen as being installed within the next 3 -5 years.
21. Appendix A, general request: would it be possible to add a column to all of the tables to show the priority level (short term, long term, low priority, opportunity) that has been assigned to each project?
22. Appendix A, Table A-5: Class III Bicycle Boulevards: Per the Bicycle Toolbox section included in this document, the motor vehicle count on Bicycle Boulevards should not exceed 1500 vehicles per day. 3rd Street, included in the table as a bike boulevard location carries 6630 cars per day from the city's information on traffic counts. Why is this treatment being proposed along this segment? Also, Humboldt Street, which currently is signed as a bike boulevard is included in this table. Are there plans to revisit it and make changes to it to improve its functionality? Traffic volume on Humboldt also far exceeds 1500 vehicles per day in all of the segments listed here. Will there be any consideration for adding traffic diversion features to reduce through car traffic along its length?

23. Appendix A, Table A-8 Studies: McConnell Ave from Mendocino to North Street is noted as being 2 miles long. I can't tell you the exact mileage, but it's probably closer to 1 mile.
24. I'd like to see the plan include language included that makes it a priority for staff to pursue grant funding to advance any of the Study projects that are located in underserved neighborhoods, especially if they're locations with a high occurrence of accidents.
25. The loading zone painted/signed curb at the Class II bike lane at southbound B and 7th street (there because the adjacent building, now the Sonoma County Museum used to be a flooring store), needs to be repainted and signed with "no parking, bike lane" signs and traffic enforcement needs to enforce this. Bicyclists traveling southbound in the lane are at risk if they need to suddenly divert into the car lane.
26. The SMART path crossing at Hearn Ave needs to be reconsidered. The current condition directs southbound bicyclists to travel against traffic to cross Hearn at the traffic light at Dowd Dr, so that they can travel against traffic back to the path on the south side of Hearn. Either the concrete median should be reconfigured to provide a crossing at the path, or the signage should be changed to direct people to travel west to the crosswalk at Dutton.
27. Additional signage directed at motorists should be provided at Sixth Street where the road sweeps northbound at the entrance to the mall parking lot alerting them to watch for cyclists. The green bike lane in this location is an improvement, but negative interactions between motorists and bicyclists continue to occur here.
28. General comment: As mentioned before with two exhibits on two different pages that share the same figure number, there are several small typos and areas where the text could benefit from a good proof reading. One example is on page 147, under Solutions for Congested Corridors programs, the first sentence doesn't make any sense.
29. And finally, I support the request from the Southeast Greenway people requesting that the preferred crossing enhancement locations noted in their plans and in their EIR at Summerfield, Yulupa, Franquette, Hoen Ave and Hoen Frontage Roads be included in this document.