

Sonoma County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

Meeting Announcement

Date: Wednesday, May 19, 2021

Time: 6:00 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.

Place: Zoom Meeting

Link: <https://zoom.us/j/95906731284>

Phone: (669) 900-9128, ID # 959 0673 1284



Staff: Steven Schmitz

(707) 585-7516

steven@sctransit.com

Agenda:

I. Introductions & Public Comments* (10 Minutes)

II. Approval of Agenda & Minutes (5 Minutes)

III. Staff Reports (10 Minutes)

- Comments Submitted for Pavement Preservation Projects.
- Report on Proposed State Legislation for Bikes & Pedestrians.
- Status of Update to the 2010 County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.
- Update from Health Services on Sonoma County Vision Zero Project.

IV. General Meeting:

- A. Discuss Applying for a 'Bicycle Friendly Communities' Designation from the League of American Bicyclist for the Unincorporated Areas. (30 minutes)
- B. Review the Committee's Draft Comments Prepared for the Sonoma County Local Coastal Plan. (30 minutes)

V. Other Business & Announcements (5 Minutes)

VI. Next Meeting & Adjournment

The next meeting of the Sonoma County BPAC is scheduled for Wednesday, Aug. 18, 2021.

*Public Comment on Issues Not on the Agenda. Please limit comments to 3 minutes each. The Committee will hear public comments on non-agenda issues within the Committee's scope of authority. The Committee will hear public comments on non-agenda issues for up to 10 minutes, at which time they will hear scheduled agenda items. Any additional public comments will be heard at the conclusion of the items that are already on the agenda.

Sonoma County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

February 17, 2021 Minutes

Page 2

Members in Attendance		Other Participants	
Brad McCarty	1 st District Alt.	Pam Tennant	5 th District Resident
Joe Morgan	2 nd District	Eris Weaver	SC Bicycle Coalition
Matt Frazier	2 nd District Alt.	Nancy Adams	City of Santa Rosa
Vin Hoagland	3 rd District	Laurel Chambers	Health Services
Amy Loukonen	4 th District (Chair)	Nader Dahu	Public Works
		Amanda Bouillerce	Public Works
		Ken Tam	Regional Parks
		Steven Schmitz	SCBPAC Staff

Meeting Summary

I. Introductions and Public Comments

Self-introductions were made. Amy Loukonen noted that the Zoom name functionality can be used to add helpful information to the nametag, such as organization or district, and requested that members do so. There were no public comments.

II. Approval of Agenda and Minutes

The February 21, 2021 meeting agenda was approved as presented. The November 18, 2020 minutes were approved with the following corrections from Ken Tam: In the last sentence of the second paragraph on page three, the words “proposes an access” should be changed to “has an existing access.” In the second sentence of the sixth paragraph on page three, the words “acquisition of what is” should be changed to “acquisition of the land”.

III. Staff Reports

Status of Petaluma Blvd. South/Kastania Road Restriping Project. The committee welcomed Nader Dahu to the meeting. Nader began by stating that currently there will be no further re-striping and that green paint will not be used at this location due to the costs associated. He then said that this is due to two reasons: the lack of capacity for maintenance and the lack of materials needed for the project. He added that they are looking for additional funding to potentially re-stripe and that the timeframe moving forward is unclear.

In response, Eris Weaver of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition stated her frustration with the status of the project in comparison to other examples of green-painted bicycle lanes in incorporated cities. Nader responded that it is not the County’s policy to use green paint and that it is not mandated. He followed by saying it is due mainly to financial constraints. Brad agreed with Eris’ frustration. Joe added that this intersection sees a lot of both vehicular and bicycle traffic and that the potential for injury is high. In response, Nader said that he is working on a way to move this project forward, but that his hands are tied with the current funding.

Sonoma County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

February 17, 2021 Minutes

Page 3

Comments from Committee on Sonoma County Local Coastal Plan Update. Staff gave an update because Gary Helfrich was not able to make it to the meeting. He said that he will review the plan in advance of the April (now May) meeting and draft comments on behalf of the BPAC for review. He closed by saying that there is still some flexibility as to when Gary needs comments from the BPAC.

Timeline for Update of the 2010 County Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan. Staff reported having been in touch with Gary Helfrich of Permit Sonoma and that, due to Gary's project load, the update will likely not happen this fiscal year. The next step will be to discuss a scope of work with Permit Sonoma. Staff said that TDA Article 3 funding will be used to cover staff time and that he hoped the update can be completed by FY 2022-2023.

Feedback from Committee on Project Development Referral Process. Staff gave an update on the project development referral process and provided a report of the stats on development referrals since they began to be tracked in September 2020. Brad asked about the correct stage of this process to weigh in regarding cumulative impacts of projects approved on a single site (e.g. Jack London Village) that might increase vehicle trips to a point of concern. He wondered who watches out for this and when it might be up to the committee to weigh in.

Staff responded by saying that PRMD has been asked about traffic impact studies but will ask again if no response is received in a timely manner. Vin then asked about the implementation timeline for requested bicycle/pedestrian improvements. Staff responded by saying that it can be a long process. The referral process is an early step in the permitting process and it can be months before a project actually breaks ground. Following that explanation, Staff added that sometimes requested conditions are discussed with PRMD staff in order to reach a compromise with a project applicant.

Review of Stony Point Rd. Corridor Study at Joe Rodota Trail Crossing. Ken Tam of Regional Parks reviewed the proposed intersection configuration for the Stony Point Road at Joe Rodota Trail Crossing. The proposed intersection improvements convert the current two-stage crosswalk and right-turn only lane on the east side of Stony Point Road into a single crossing with curb extensions. This is meant to enhance visibility of pedestrians and bicyclists crossing and slow down traffic entering the eastbound Hwy.12 on-ramp.

Vin asked if traffic heading northbound on Stony Point would have to stop before turning on to the eastbound Hwy.12 off- ramp. Ken answered that with the new signalization and the removal of the right-turn only lane, traffic would have to stop before turning right during the red signal phase.

Vision Zero Update. Laurel Chambers from Health Services shared the draft Vision Zero Dashboard on SCTA's website. The key takeaway from the data presented is that bicycles and pedestrians make up a disproportionate share of deaths by mode in Sonoma County.

Sonoma County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

February 17, 2020 Minutes

Page 4

Also, she reported that they applied for a Speed Management workshop grant through UC Berkeley's SafeTREC lab. The selected applicant will be awarded three tailored speed management workshops to help develop a speed management plan. To close, she stated that the next priority for Vision Zero will be to examine local Road Safety Plans to feed into the upcoming Vision Zero Plan.

Other Updates. Ken reported that the 0.2-mile West County Trail extension to Forestville Park has now been completed, and that it used \$200,000 in TDA Article 3 funding. Joe raised the point that the new wooden boardwalk could pose a safety risk for bicycle riders when it's wet and asked if grip tape could be added. Ken responded that he would follow-up with Regional Parks maintenance staff to see what improvements can be made to remedy this. Finally, Ken provided an update on the Copeland Creek crossing project, stating that they submitted a grant application to the Open Space District using \$200,000 from TDA Article 3 funding to leverage additional funding. He explained that the meandering alignment of the proposed project is due to the topography of the site.

Brad requested clarification of the path surface and Ken responded that the path will be a compacted aggregate due to the clay soil predominant in the area. Amy then asked if the path alignment was routed away from the Native American burial site discovered in the area and Ken confirmed that it had been.

IV. General Meeting

A. Overview of Sonoma County's So-Co Report-It System and the Process for Responding to Issues. Staff introduced Amanda Bouillercce, the Customer Service and Grants Manager for Transportation and Public Works (TPW), and said she was provided with the committee's questions from previous meetings and from past correspondence. Amanda recently joined TPW and is responsible for the So-Co Report-It System. Amanda began by reviewing concerns regarding the lack of consistency around responses and communication from the system. She cited the disconnect between when fixes are made in the real-world versus what is updated in the reporting system. If a repair is performed or a problem remedied, it does not necessarily show up as being solved in So-Co Report-It. She stated that she plans to rectify this moving forward, to the extent feasible, by communicating with staff in TPW to ensure that follow-ups occur on tickets in the system.

Amanda clarified that some form of response will be given within 30 days of a report, but that this does not necessarily mean a solution will occur within 30 days. If a response is not provided within 30 days, she requested that members let her know. She caveated that regional emergencies can affect this timeline. Finally, she closed by saying that significant hazards that are immediate and dangerous can be reported by directly calling the Road Yard during business hours. Outside of business hours, immediate hazards should be reported to California Highway Patrol (CHP).

Sonoma County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

February 17, 2021 Minutes

Page 5

Moving on from this topic, Amanda addressed several questions from the past correspondence provided to her. First, in response to a query about whether the So-Co Report-It system could serve as a clearinghouse for all hazards in the county, even if they are outside TPW's jurisdiction, she stated that it cannot. This is due to the volume of requests, to the point where it would be infeasible for TPW to be the responding agency for all of them. However, she stated that it is reasonable for TPW to provide the name of the responsible agency in the event a report is closed due to being outside TPW's jurisdiction.

Amanda then addressed how someone could respond in the event that they believe a determination made in So-Co Report-It is inadequate, such as a road hazard being deemed not in need of repair. In this case, she requested that members contact her directly, and stated that her contact information will be shared at the end of this presentation. She moved on to the concern about street signs being down. She stated that stop signs qualify as an immediate concern and should be remedied immediately, while other street signs should be repaired within two weeks. In the event that this does not happen, she reiterated that she is the best point of contact.

Amanda then reported that historical data about repairs are not available for viewing in the system, but that she might have the potential to investigate specific issues. To make such a request, she asked that members email her directly. Along the same lines, the system is also unable to allow users to self-classify the risk level of issues reported. She requested that members provide as much information as possible with each report, including detailed descriptions and photos, which will then better inform the response by TPW and ensure the correct party addresses the issue.

Moving on, Amanda acknowledged the high volume of concerns around road debris. She said that while Recology is under contract to provide street sweeping services, TPW is responsible for oversight. As such, concerns about the quality or frequency of street sweeping should be submitted to So-Co Report-It. Also, she addressed the list of 20 roads prioritized for sweeping by SCBPAC. She clarified that a road on the list is swept every fifth Monday, or in other words, once every five weeks.

Amanda then opened the floor to questions. Amy started by requesting status on the program for inmate crews performing road maintenance, a program suspended due to COVID. Amanda did not have information available on this, but stated she would find out. Brad followed by requesting that the quality of ticket closures be monitored as part of Amanda's oversight. He suggested a feature that could solicit feedback on ticket responses from those who originally submitted the report. Amanda responded that this was a good suggestion but that this feature might not be present in the current system, although she will continue to be the best person to contact if someone believes a ticket response was not adequate. Brad then followed by asking whether upgrades could be made to the current system. Amanda said internal discussions were happening on this subject but that she could not give any updates at this time.

Sonoma County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

February 17, 2021 Minutes

Page 6

Eris Weaver of the Sonoma County Bicycle Coalition asked for information on how tickets are routed within the system. She said that she is aware of issues with signage put up by local residents on County roads that give the impression that the road is private, possibly as a way to discourage bicycle use. She believes that TPW needs an appropriate response to address this in the system. Amanda addressed the first question by stating that tickets are routed to different managers based on the category of the ticket, and reiterated that she is an additional layer of contact if a response seems inadequate. At this point, Eris added that she has received conflicting responses regarding the correct agency to contact regarding the stated issue. Amanda asked Eris to send her an email regarding this specific case, and that she will follow-up.

Amanda added an update that an adopt-a-road program has officially been launched by TPW, but it is not yet advertised on TPW's website. She then provided the following contact information promised in this discussion:

amanda.bouillerc@sonoma-county.org

707-565-1833

Adopt-a-Road: Clyde Galantine

clyde.galantine@sonoma-county.org

TPW Road Yard: 707-565-5100

CHP Napa: 707-253-4906

CHP Santa Rosa: 707-588-1400

Brad asked if the Road Yard expects calls from the public. Amanda said that they should transfer any calls to the appropriate party to take down the immediate information reported. Staff thanked Amanda and pointed out that sometimes the feedback given through So-Co Report-It is also positive.

B. Review and Approve FY 2021/2022 Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article 3 Three-Year Funding Plan. Staff opened the presentation by reviewing the details of the TDA Article 3 Three-Year Funding Plan. Clarification was made that 2% of the funding provided through a state sales tax for public transportation agencies is allocated to bicycle and pedestrian projects. In Sonoma County, this comes out to about \$145,000 a year for the unincorporated areas, a majority of which is used to leverage local grants.

Staff then providing the funding spreadsheet and described the various elements of the plan, including the funding sources for each project budgeted for the next three fiscal years. The revenue balances were highlighted for each fiscal year in the plan, noting that the slightly negative balance in FY 2023-24 (\$16,429) is acceptable because revenue the following fiscal year can be used to pay it back.

Staff then turned the floor over to committee members for questions. Brad asked if the committee is being asked to evaluate the entire list of projects, or just the ones being funded

Sonoma County Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee

February 17, 2021 Minutes

Page 7

with TDA Article 3. Staff affirmed that they are only being asked to evaluate projects funded with TDA Article 3. Brad followed up by asking whether anything has changed on this project list. Steven answered that the only changes are projects being pushed back a year or two, and asked Ken to clarify the absence of the Copeland Creek trail crossing on the plan. Ken responded by saying that the \$200,000 already spent was used to apply for a much larger grant for the project. Nader added that the design for Arnold Drive project will be coming this spring.

At this point, Brad asked how Measure DD fits in to the funding plan, and if funds can be added to this plan. Steven answered that there is not yet any dedicated funding for individual bicycle and pedestrian projects in Measure DD and it will be a competitive process. It is probable that Measure DD funds will eventually be incorporated into the funding plan. After answering this, Staff then requested a vote from the committee to approve the funding plan, which was granted unanimously.

V. Other Business & Announcements

Brad requested a future agenda item to discuss Measure DD funding and potential TPW and Regional Parks bicycle and pedestrian projects.

Staff announced that Caltrans is embarking on a bike highway study in District 4. A link to the study will be provided to committee members to review and provide feedback to Caltrans. Additionally, staff said that Caltrans is continuing to work on the District 4 Pedestrian Plan.

Finally, staff added that preparing an application to request a Bicycle Friendly Community designation from the League of American Bicyclists for the County's unincorporated areas is a good idea. Staff plans on bringing this up with TPW and Regional Parks and will bring the item back to the committee with more details at a future meeting.

Nader offered an update on their Local Road Safety Plan, which was approved by Caltrans and originally discussed during the committee's meeting in February.

VI. Next Meeting & Adjournment

Amy said that the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for April 21, 2021.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:50 pm.