Bicycling, Transportation, and Street Safety Commission (BTSSC)
Community Chambers
23 Russell Boulevard
Thursday, February 11, 2016
5:30 p.m.

MINUTES

Commissioners: John Berg (Chair), Earl Bossard, Daniel Fuchs, Mike Mitchell (Vice Chair), Raoul Renaud, Jim Skeen, Doug Waterman, Jon Watterson

Staff Liaison: Brian Mickelson, Assistant City Engineer / Transportation Manager
Brian Abbanat, Transportation Planner

Council Liaison: Brett Lee, Robb Davis (alternate)

Absent: Beth Bourne

1. Approval of Agenda
Unanimously approved.

2. Commission and Staff Announcements

Commissioner Fuchs stated he attended a presentation on Dutch bicycling infrastructure.

Commissioner Berg announced he and vice-chair Mitchell had their monthly meeting with Jennifer Donofrio and Brian Abbanat for an update on the bike/ped program. Stated Jennifer is re-thinking the wayfinding project based on commission feedback. An ad hoc committee will be established and interest from commissioners was solicited.

Commissioners Skeen, Mitchell, Bossard, and Waterman expressed interest.

Brian Abbanat announced that the Sterling Apartments project on Fifth Street will come to the commission next month.

Commissioner Mitchell requested materials be presented well in advance.

3. Council Liaison Comments

Councilmember Lee stated he also attended the Dutch cycling infrastructure presentation. Speaker stated Davis should eliminate traffic signals and replace with roundabouts. Noted Council may be willing to provide more funds.

Councilmember Lee referenced the J Street and Covell Boulevard intersection. Stated it doesn’t look or function like he thought it would. Not sure where in the process design changes occur.
Councilmember Davis stated the City is examining alternative crossings at the Cannery. Should have something before Council around March or April.

Councilmember Davis stated he attended the Dutch cycling infrastructure presentation. Regarding J Street and Covell, presenter stated the City is trying to do too much with the street, resulting in wider streets and longer crossing times. Can learn from it and possibly do better in the future.

4. Public Communications:

Mark Dushovsky, Open Space and Habitat Commission, invited commissioners to participate in an open space planning workshop on 3/9. Purpose is to check in with the community on Measure O expenditures.

Alan Hirsch: Stated the delay of the grade-separated bicycle connection at the Cannery is placing demands on staff. We need to look at what’s happening. The City didn’t make the Cannery pay for infrastructure that we needed, a consequence of not having a plan in place ahead of time.

Darrell Dickey reinforced that the J Street and Covell Blvd intersection is not a Dutch intersection. The design tries to please everybody. The intent is to slow everybody down to a human scale. The intersection was supposed to be a great facility.

5. Approval of Minutes: 1/14/16 Meeting

Approved unanimously with revisions.

6. Mace Ranch Innovation Center (MRIC) Project

Heidi Tschudin, staff contract planner for the MRIC project, provided an overview of the project including:

- Project statistics
- Timeline
- FEIR overview
- FEIR master comments
- BTSSC comments
- Project decisions
- Questions for commission input:
  - Is the project consistent with Guiding Principles as they relate to transportation?
  - Which alternative does the commission support?
  - Recommendations on design & features.

Bob Grandy, Fehr & Peers, provided an overview of the project’s transportation analysis including:

- Mitigations
- Comments
- Travel metric
- Mixed use alternative sensitivity assessment.
- Stated that ~35% employee occupancy rate is the threshold for reduced VMT vs. commercial-only project.

Dan Ramos provided a brief overview of the project development process. Introduced the developer team. Stated the mixed use alternative made the project better. They conducted focus groups, outreach to companies. Conclusion was housing nearby is needed.

A development consultant team member passed out a table of baseline versus mixed use performance and compatibility with Guiding Principle #3.

Prakash Pinto, development consultant team lead, explained the differences between the baseline project and mixed use alternative.

Project development team explained project commitments including 1) Class1 bike path connection on inside of Mace curve and 2) Grade separated crossing of Mace Blvd. Will conduct “Mitigation Study Areas” that could include 1) Bike crossing @ CR 32A / CR 105, 2) CR 32A bike connection to causeway and 3) Bike repair kiosks.

Commission Questions:

Commissioner Watterson stated that with newer projects, he’s seeing bikeways and pathways not associated with streets. Was hoping to see more of that than the grid pattern. Is encouraged by the NW corner grade separated crossing.

Commissioner Renaud asked about housing types and price range.
Prakash Pinto responded costs are not known but are looking at loft-type units with alley-loaded garages, a housing type not currently offered in town. Trying to respond to the next generation of workers & innovation centers. The density would be higher than anything at Cannery.

Commissioner Fuchs asked what is being done at the Second and Mace intersection.
Steve Greenfield responded that more study is needed but commitments to enhancements are part of the project.
Bob Grandy stated that intersection can be configured similarly to what is proposed for the Alhambra intersection.

Commissioner Skeen inquired by assumptions of housing rental to ownership ratios.
Dan Ramos replied that 60%-70% are imagined for rent. Objective is to create a community. Some fine tuning will be needed.

Commissioner Mitchell asked how to ensure employees work and live on the site.
Dan Ramos responded timing is a factor and whether it is ready when the jobs are there. Density helps with affordability but it will be a challenge.

Prakash Pinto added that the type of housing envisioned would be unique to Davis: >60 units/acre. Housing utilizes the site better. Many changes are occurring in the way
people work, live, & play. They are trying to accommodate those changes by offering housing options for some of the larger employers who are hiring graduate students. Employer subsidies are a possibility also. Housing helps front load the financing for backbone infrastructure.

Commissioner Berg asked if the development team has been in communication with Caltrans.

Dan Ramos responded they have from the early project stages and with the Director.

Commissioner Berg asked if the innovation center companies can own housing and rent/lease to employees.

Dan Ramos answered affirmatively but stated they typically don’t. They use third-party providers.

Public Comment:

Alan Hirsch stated this was the standard presentation and the numbers aren’t adding up. Noted a discrepancy in the documentation regarding parking acreage. Stated parking is the single largest use: four times more parking than green space. Stated the pictures portrayed are not physically possible. Asked if this project is density or dense sprawl, stating it appears to be tall buildings in a sea of parking.

Commission Comments:

Commissioner Berg explained the three questions being asked of the commission.

Commissioner Renaud stated he’s on the fence regarding Question #1, supports mixed-use alternative (Question #2), and is concerned about adding lanes to the Mace Blvd curve.

Commissioner Mitchell stated a guarded yes for Question #1. Noted many aspirational claims but unsure how many will really happen. Supports mixed-use alternative (Question #2), if he must choose one. Prefers to see cycle tracks through the project. Concerned about Mace. Free-right turns have to go. Cyclists & peds shouldn’t have to merge across travel lanes. Did not see desire lines & natural patterns of travel designed into project.

Commissioner Watterson:

Question #1: Stated there’s too much parking. We have many alternatives. Noted City’s transportation mode share goals. Would like to see not a car-based layout, a more integrated plan. Bothered that grade separated crossings are not part of baseline project. CR 32A mitigation needs better planning, separation between cars & bikes. We’re not there.

Question #2: Supports mixed-use alternative if it can be integrated into the surrounding community.

Commissioner Fuchs:

Question #1: Not sure if project is consistent with Guiding Principles. Vehicular connectivity is very clear. Sees a lot of vehicular connections and conceptual bike/ped
connections. No good sense of how the project will be connected to the rest of the City. It may be there at some point, but it’s not there right now.

Consultant team member Matt stated, the development team has some hesitancy because City has expressed desire to make decisions related to bike/ped connections.

Question #2: Strongly supports mixed-use alternative.

Question #3: Prefers solar panels over trees. Favors separate bike & ped facilities. CR 32A is not a viable access route to the site.

Commissioner Bossard:

Question #1: Strongly favors the mixed-use alternative.

Question #2: There should be no Class II bike lanes. Grade separated crossing should be included in baseline project. Transit plaza should have sun, rain protection.

Commissioner Skeen:

Question #1: Agrees project is consistent with Guiding Principles. Mace is an issue and has some concerns about traffic details.

Question #2: Does not support mixed-use alternative because he does not believe they will be occupied by employees.

Question #3: Take pressure off SW intersection access. Grade separated crossing needs to be built first.

Commissioner Waterman stated he’s not in favor of the project and is dissatisfied with the answers.

Commissioner Berg stated project could be consistent with Guiding Principles if concerns are addressed (Question #1). Supports mixed-use alternative (Question #2). Generally agrees with other commissioners regarding project design recommendations.

7. Downtown Circulation

Deferred to a future meeting.

8. Long Range Calendar

No discussion.

9. Adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 8:04 p.m. (Bossard, Skeen)