On Thursday, March 28, 2019, the City of Davis held a facilitated second meeting with neighbors of the Mace Blvd Complete Street Project. The desired outcomes of the second meeting were to:

- Hear and document residents’ and county neighbors’ concerns.
- Hear and document residents’ and county neighbors’ ideas for addressing concerns.
- Give residents and county neighbors a place to express emotions.
- Create a clear list of concerns for City staff to address at the May 15, 2019, meeting.

Prior to this meeting, concerns regarding the project were raised in online NextDoor discussions and during the public comment period of the January 22, 2019 City Council Meeting. Articles discussing these concerns appeared in the Davis Enterprise and the Vanguard. Mayor Brett Lee quickly scheduled a neighborhood meeting for January 23, 2019, at Fire Station 33 with City Staff where additional concerns were raised.

Below are the combined concerns identified about the project including those generated from the March 28th Meeting and subsequent emails sent after the March 28th Meeting. Following the concerns are the suggestions heard at the March 28th Meeting.

Updates from the January 22, 2019, meeting are available on the City’s Construction Projects website. Detailed plans of the project are also available.

Additional neighborhood meetings are scheduled for April 11, 2019, and May 15, 2019, at Fire Station 33.

**NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS AS OF MARCH 28, 2019**

1. **CONGESTION**
   A. I-80 traffic uses Davis City streets to avoid congestion. Bad from 3PM during commute weekdays.
   B. Mobile Apps encourage I-80 through traffic to divert to City streets.
   C. I-80 ramp metering backing up traffic onto Chiles Rd and Mace Blvd.
   D. Increased congestion affecting Pioneer & Montgomery Elementary Schools and Harper Junior High School during AM & PM commutes.
   E. Travel time from Mace Blvd to high school has doubled on weekdays.
F. Most “get-around-congestion” streets (Second St, East Eighth St, Pole Line Rd, Chiles Rd, Mace Blvd) are also congested.
G. Decreased air quality due to idling traffic.
H. Decreased overall quality of life due to time stuck in traffic.

2. TRAFFIC ENGINEERING
   A. Right-turn from Mace Blvd (NB) onto Cowell Blvd (EB) is too tight – the single traffic lane slows both through-traffic and right-turn traffic.
   B. No right-turn lanes.
   C. All right-hand turns are hazardous with counter traffic.
   D. Right-turns from North El Macero Dr onto Mace Blvd are restricted with curb and bike lane.
   E. Wide crosswalks and tight turn radius make right turns difficult for regular cars and larger vehicles.
   F. Wide crosswalks have cars stop too far back from intersection.
   G. More difficult to make right turns on red at WB Cowell to NB Mace.
   H. Difficult to make turns when using trailer or when vehicles are also turning into your street.
   I. Only one lane for left turn, through and right turn moves at Cowell. Traffic often backed up beyond El Macero Shopping Center driveway. Can’t turn left from parking lot.
   J. Left-turn from San Marino Dr to NB Mace Blvd consistently difficult to make. No left-turn off of Redbud Dr and other streets onto Mace Blvd.
   K. Delineation (striping, dots, signage) unclear – concern re. unfamiliar non-Davis drivers.
   L. No turnout for transit bus.
   M. Difficulty for wide farm vehicles to travel on Mace Blvd.
   N. The concrete dividers between bike lanes and traffic lanes are confusing, look like sidewalks and are sometimes unexpected.
   O. Pedestrian plazas too large.
   P. Islands are too large.
   Q. Islands are ugly.
   R. Need more than two lanes to accommodate traffic.
   S. Lane width is too tight.
   T. Reducing Mace from a boulevard (major arterial & truck route) to a residential street (complete street).
3. CONSTRUCTION
   A. Construction completion delay.
   B. Flooding / puddling during construction.
   C. Difficulty getting to the “suicide lane” (a bidirectional center lane used for turning or passing) when turning left onto Mace Blvd from the El Macero Shopping Center.

4. SAFETY
   A. Right-turn from Mace Blvd (NB) onto Cowell Blvd too tight – potential rear-end accidents.
   B. Observed near collisions when turning right from Cowell onto NB Mace.
   C. Bulb-out crosswalk opening too large – invites cars into bike / pedestrian space. Once entered, cars get stuck between the curbing.
   D. Potential collisions with raised curbs.
   E. Speeding (i.e., El Macero Estates, El Macero Drive, and all streets off Mace Blvd.)
   F. EB on-ramp east of Mace near fruit stand backs up beyond soccer fields on north and south side of freeway at the same time. Frustrated drivers make dangerous U-turns back to Mace.
   G. Poor delineation.
   H. Nugget parking lot is used as a detour around congestion.
   I. Drivers unfamiliar with local streets.
   J. Frustrated local drivers.
   K. Island’s boulder surface not walkable.
   L. No sidewalk on NE corner of Mace and Cowell.
   M. Sidewalks bad on Mace (COD, YC).
   N. Where there is no sidewalk, people walk in the street rather than in the dirt.
   O. People driving in bike lane making right-turns.
   P. Must cross bike lane and curb to access transit bus stop.
   Q. People using the southbound lane when driving northbound on Mace Blvd to make a left-turn (potential for head-on collisions).
   R. Lighting is bad.

5. ENFORCEMENT
   A. People driving in bike lane (to get around congestion).
   B. People parking in bike lane.
   C. Illegal U-turns.
   D. During congestion, people use bike lane to pass at excessive speed.
6. PUBLIC NOTICE
   A. Not enough communication with impacted residents over 5-year period (between 30%
      design and construction).
   B. El Macero (county) residents were not noticed.
   C. Farmers south of Redbud Rd were not noticed.

7. FIRE DEPARTMENT
   A. Congestion impacts fire engineer response times.
   B. NW bulb-out at Cowell Blvd and Mace Blvd makes fire engine egress more difficult.
   C. Cars backed up and stopped in front of the fire station.
   D. No markings for emergency vehicle egress from Fire Station 33.

8. FINANCES
   A. City
      i) Sunk costs: $2.1M federal grants from SACOG and $964,328 local General Fund
         and Road Impact Fee funds. (Source: Davis Enterprise.)
      ii) Changes to design require additional funding.
      iii) Questioning project in general.
      iv) Extra wear and tear on City streets due to increased use by I-80 Mobile App
         drivers.
      v) Added police cost due to increased traffic enforcement.
      vi) Threat of legal suits: individual or class action.
   B. Personal
      i) Concerns about increased home insurance cost due to longer emergency
         response times.
      ii) Concerns about lower property values due to congestion.
   C. Business
      i) Increased transportation costs for farmers / trucking companies due to
         congestion.

9. GENERAL TRAFFIC / STREET MAINTENANCE IRRITATIONS
   A. Traffic disruption due to multiple projects at once e.g., Mace Blvd, L St/Covell,
      Cannery, 3rd Street Improvements, Tim Spenser Alley.
   B. Increase in potholes after rains.
   C. Perceived low quality construction needing repair too soon.
   D. Perceived equity of paving project locations.
   E. Raised maintenance-hole covers.
   F. Use of tax moneys in general.
10. WAIT TO JUDGE UNTIL AFTER PROJECT COMPLETED
   A. Don’t remove elements and lose the benefit before we’ve had the time to actual use the completed project.

11. IMPACT ON BICYCLING
   A. Attendee is using bike lanes as being constructed and feels more comfortable going on family bike rides with young children along Mace Blvd than did prior to the construction.
   B. Negatively impacts desire to bicycle.
   C. Afraid to bicycle due to congested motorists’ road rage.
   D. Afraid to bicycle due to confinement of bike lane.
   E. Older El Macero residents are not the target for improved bicycle lanes.
   F. Debris gathers in bike lane due to high curbs.
   G. Difficulty street sweeping bicycle lane using regular protocols.

12. ADA COMPLIANCE
   A. Lack of accessible parking on SB Mace Blvd (specific issue for a resident).
   B. Lack of accessible access to Bus Stop between San Marino Drive and Redbud Dr.

13. COORDINATION WITH COUNTY
   A. County Right-of-Way Engineering not included in project planning.

14. REQUESTS FOR MORE INFORMATION
   A. What source will additional funding come from in order to make changes to the current state of the existing design?
   B. Original goals of project.
   C. Provide on website original design and grant documents.

NEIGHBORHOOD SUGGESTIONS

HEARD AT MARCH 28, 2019, MEETING
   A. Four lanes on Mace Blvd.
   B. If we can’t have 4 lanes on Mace Blvd, have 3 lanes – 2 northbound, 1 southbound.
   C. Right turns lanes.
   D. Another overpass.
   E. Fix ramp metering.
   F. Remove curbs.
   G. Put a stop sign at Redbud Dr.
   H. Move curb (for protected bike area) eight feet to east (onto County right-of-way).
   I. Add signage for “right turn on red” and move up striping for stop line.
J. Put documentation related to the progress of the project on a website.
K. Just repaint bike area green like on 5th street (without curbs).
L. Send out diagrams and updates via email to those who provided emails at this meeting.
M. Put in a 3-way stop at both Mace Blvd & San Marino Dr and Mace Blvd & Redbud Dr.
N. Elimination of free right turns increases safety.
O. Don’t just “do” things to fix the project; let residents weigh-in first.