

# MEMORANDUM



TRUSTED ENGINEERING ADVISORS

**TO:** Roxanne Namazi – City of Davis  
**FROM:** Leo Rubio  
**DATE:** February 27, 2008  
**SUBJECT:** Summary of Public Comments (2/12/09 – 2/27/09)

Bennett Engineering Services  
 1082 Sunrise Avenue, Suite 100  
 Roseville, California 95661

T 916.783.4100  
 F 916.783.4110

www.bennettengineeringservices.com

|   |                           |         |
|---|---------------------------|---------|
| Jean-Philippe Marie   | jpmarie@ucdavis.edu       | 2/12/09 |
| <p>Comment: I don't like the route 1 that runs alongside the freeway and ends-up in West Davis. I do like route 2 or 3 arriving in a more central location, near Community Park.</p>  |                           |         |
| Karl Krist  | kakrist@gmail.com         | 2/16/09 |
| <p>Comment: I am writing you regarding the alternative transportation path between Woodland and Davis. From reading the planning documents, I know that County Road 102 is not part of this current plan, but I think it should be. Currently the CR 102 path does serve some bike commuters, but frankly, most people are unwilling to use that road because of the danger from the traffic which has increased greatly since the route was first created. Rather than throw away the gains that have gone into that route, money should be spent to improve it to the point where people would actually want to use it.</p> <p>Many of the goals stated in your plan could be achieved by IMPROVING the CR 102 bike route. For instance, lowering the speed limit and adding a traffic light at CR 27 and CR 102 would make the route safer for both bicycles and cars. When possible, adding a small barrier, or divider between the bike lane and the traffic would be greatly helpful. Creating a class I bike lane the entire distance of the route would be the best possible scenario.</p> <p>Right now the route to the primary future destination in Woodland is dangerous. Let's fix that problem before moving on to a route that has not be proven to be useful at all.</p>  |                           |         |
| Paul Erickson   | paerickson@ucdavis.edu    | 2/23/09 |
| <p>I think that the work you are performing on an offroad bike way is a great thing however there maybe some other options to consider. I am sending this article attached below to the Woodland Record and this has direct impact on your work thus I thought you should have a look at the preprint version. BTW If you are serious about a woodland davis bike corridor ie an Off road bikeway you should consider the option of connecting the west frontage roads along 113. If the connectors were open to only bikes evehicles etc this would maximize the existng investment in the roads along rose lane and the other frontage roads (sorry the names are escaping me right now). this actually only requires connectors across willow slough and the train track at the south end of Woodland's east street. Getting down east street however may be problematic as there are no bike lanes now. Sending the bicycle commuters down the exisiting train track to near poleline in Davis as some have suggested is a complete waste in my opinion. this is somewhat of a selfish opinion as I am headed to the university but I think that you will find that the bulk of bike commuters are heading for the university regions and if you send them out to poleline they wont take the path. I certainly wont add another 2 miles to my trip and will countinue to take 99. Remember that whole thing about trip generation from school? If the end point isnt at the correct location people wont take the trip especially bike commuters. Miles correlate directly to use as this is not just a small pushing of the accelerator as in a car but makes my entire commute at least 20% longer. In my opinion The end points of any bike route should be between East and West street in Woodland and Sycamore and Lake in Davis. Anywhere beyond those points and I doubt the bulk of riders will even consider using it. because of where I live I personally would love an off road route paralleling 98 but I doubt many bike comutters would use it. Same for road 102. However most would use it if the put in and take out points were more centrally located as described. My two cents.</p> |                           |         |
| Andrew Dowling  | andrewdowling@comcast.net | 2/13/09 |
| <p>I received the notice concerning the Woodland - Davis alternative transportation corridor meeting. I will be out of town and unable to attend the February 23rd meeting; However, I would like to learn more about the project and</p>   |                           |         |

let you know that there could be an additional alternative route.

My father and I own 113 acres of land North of the Davis city limits and might be willing to allow a "bike path" along the western edge of the parcel (see attached map). We already have an easement for a path (I believe for just our personal use for now) through the parcel to the south that could meet up with the existing dirt path along the "drainage canal". I have spoken with the owners to the north too (appx 50 acres) and they too might be receptive to a path through their land (along the western edge (appx. halfway between hwy113 and 101a (F Street).

Do you have any initial thoughts concerning the feasibility of this scenario.

Paul E. Pfothenauer

pepfotenhauer@ucdavis.edu

2/25/09

I have worked at UC Davis for more than 30 years and have used my bicycle occasionally to commute to work from Woodland to Davis. The reason I don't do much of it anymore is simply the danger. As you get closer to Davis, motorists are accustomed to bike traffic. Woodlanders, unfortunately, are not. I have had several close calls on the 99 (West St) route to Davis. I cross over at 27 to Tiechert's and take the frontage road to Davis. I would be more than happy to pay a user fee for a separate route between the two cities. The four-foot extension public works has added is nice, but not adequate. The debris on the shoulder collects in that 4 foot span and flats are common on road bikes. I often rode with Willie Lopez, and when he was killed on that route, I have been more reluctant to ride. I think the separate route is a great idea, and user fees I think should be mandatory so that the roadbed can be occasionally swept and maintained by the county. I think you would see bicycle ridership go up dramatically including weekends when people want exercise. Keep up the good work Petrea.

Craig Childers

cchilder@arb.ca.gov

2/23/09

I may not be able to make it to your meeting this evening, but I attached some comments on the proposed Woodland-Davis low speed corridor. I have extensive driving and technical experience with both bicycles and NEVs. Most of my comments have to do with NEVs and mixed NEV-bicycle use. I think the concept is a great idea, but the "devil is in the details".

Woodland-Davis Pathway Comments:

> Please make sure that the pathway is located such that there is a network of connecting roads at each end that are NEV legal (posted <= 35 mph).

> Passing and roadway width: I drive a narrow lane electric enclosed motorcycle on the I80 auxiliary lane over the Yolo bypass , and have done so since 1992. My biggest issue is passing! There are usually no issues when I pass serious cyclists riding single file. Some cyclists even wear rear-view mirrors and pull over to let me pass. The problem is when I come up on slow, less serious bicyclists riding 2 or 3 across taking up the full width of the path. They cannot hear me, and usually, they cannot even hear the bell I ring to let them know I want to pass. Some intentionally block both lanes even after they turn and see me- maybe they assume I'm not supposed to be there. For others that don't know I'm there, using my horn is usually too rude, and so, I'm stuck for several miles going much slower than I'd hoped to go (8- 12 mph). CalTRANS has a stripe down the middle of this lane to give users a hint that they should try to stay in the right lane, but, usually they don't. Note that this is also an issue for serious cyclists trying to pass slow groups riding side-by-side, not just for NEVs. I think that 25 mph NEVs passing (or trying to pass) 8-12 mph side-by-side cyclists is a potential challenge. Perhaps there needs to be signage that recommends or requires that cyclists ride single file?

> There are several aftermarket parts suppliers that sell illegal kits to make NEVs go faster than the 25 mph designed-in limit, and, because of this, there is a growing number of illegally modified NEVs on the road. Some have already been involved in serious accidents. I have no idea how police are going to deal with this challenging issue- it's not just a speeding ticket, it's also a vehicle with illegal modifications (possible confiscation instead of citation?). This means you will probably need to explicitly state that the speed limit on the proposed path is 25 mph. Having NEVs at 25 mph driving with slower bicycles is a challenge. Having this group of illegally modified NEVs drive 35+ mph along with bicyclists would be a disaster.

> If it is decided to allow NEVs, please keep in mind that these vehicles are not yet very well developed. My wife drives one of the better models, a Chrysler GEM, with over 15,000 City of Davis miles on it, but, I know that there is no way it could make the round trip to Costco in Woodland. On cold days, or during the final year(s) of the battery's life, or if heavily loaded, it might not even make it one way to Costco Woodland. Still, it's a tremendously practical and useful in-town vehicle. It may be that future technology will result in NEVs with more range than with those available today- perhaps we are proposing a pathway that would allow for these future NEVs to travel between cities? The point I need to make is that many NEV enthusiasts (and dealers) will be telling you how

necessary such a pathway will be for them, but we will only discover later-on that most of their NEVs cannot actually make it. Got a plan for NEV roadside assistance? Why not host a Spring NEV rally where we assemble a bunch of volunteer NEVs, get some police escort and approval, make the trip across, and see what happens? (don't forget to schedule some tow trucks!)

> There will be a wide variety of electric scooters and electric motorcycles on the market very soon. The drivers of these e scooters will very much like to make use of the proposed path, but I would suggest that their higher speed would not mix well with the bicycles, and that you might have to specifically exclude them. Also, be very sure to exclude enclosed electric motorcycles. These categories don't have speed restrictions and are legal to travel on the regular highway, so, they don't need a special pathway.

> If you choose to allow NEVs, please make sure you add some further restrictions to the Federal LSV or CA DMV 385.5 LSV definition. These categories, as defined, could include non-electric LSVs with engines. If you intend only to allow NEV (zero emission LSVs), you would need to add a further restriction to the CVC 385.5 definition. (note that the last sentence in the Vehicle Code definition is actually incorrect- Federal LSVs may include vehicles other than NEVs.)

If you have some sort of Pathway advisory panel, let me know.

|  |                          |         |
|--|--------------------------|---------|
| David Van Muyden   | dvanmuyden@sbcglobal.net | 2/23/09 |
| Have you looked into connecting the path to the one already from Davis to Sac?   |                          |         |
| Cathryn Lawrence   | cathrynlawrence@mac.com  | 2/23/09 |
| Materials with readable street names, location of Willow Slough etc are needed, map presented tonight is shockingly inadequate for presenting alignments 1-3 for the "new" bikeway options. Current map is unreadable. Current presentation is inadequate for explaining to the public the vision/goals to set the stage for discussion. |                          |         |
|  |                          |         |