

# Appendix G: Resolution of Plan Adoption; Council Comments; Revisions to Final Plan



1 local agencies to develop and maintain comprehensive active transportation plans consistent with  
2 the regional plan; and

3 **WHEREAS**, City staff conducted a robust, multi-year effort to gather public input from  
4 a broad range of stakeholders and reaffirmed the Community’s commitment to plan for and  
5 construct improved active transportation infrastructure; and

6 **WHEREAS**, the proposed City of Chico ATP provides a specific framework for  
7 implementing the Community’s vision of the City’s active transportation goals, policies, and  
8 actions contained within the General Plan, built upon a balanced approach to Equity, Diversity,  
9 and Inclusion (EDI); Engineering; Education; Encouragement; and Evaluation values to guide  
10 future policies, goals, projects, and program development; and

11 **WHEREAS**, the proposed City of Chico ATP envisions a complete active transportation  
12 network composed of existing active transportation infrastructure and proposed new active  
13 transportation facilities that will provide safer and more direct routes to key destinations for both  
14 utilitarian and recreational bicycling; and

15 **WHEREAS**, the proposed City of Chico ATP replaces the existing Chico Bicycle Plan  
16 2019 Update; and

17 **WHEREAS**, the adoption of the City of Chico ATP is exempt from environmental  
18 review in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) pursuant to  
19 Public Resources Code Section 21080.20(a)(1).

20 **NOW, THEREFORE**, be it resolved that the City Council of the City of Chico as  
21 follows:

22 SECTION 1. The City Council hereby finds and determines that the adoption of this  
23 Resolution is exempt from CEQA pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21080.20(a)(1),  
24 which provides that CEQA does not apply to an active transportation plan.

25 SECTION 2. The City Council hereby adopts the Chico Active Transportation Plan to  
26 provide a vision, structure, and direction for a continuing process of improving active  
27 transportation safety and comfort and encouraging active transportation as both a practical mode  
28

1 of transportation for utilitarian tasks and a healthy choice for recreation to benefit both residents  
2 of and visitors to the City of Chico.

3 SECTION 3. The City Council further authorizes the City Manager to execute such  
4 ancillary documents or take such actions reasonably necessary to effectuate the intent of this  
5 Resolution.

6 SECTION 4. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

7  
8 **THE FOREGOING RESOLUTION WAS ADOPTED** by the City Council of the City  
9 of Chico at its meeting held on December 5, 2023 by the following vote:

10 ///  
11 ///  
12 ///  
13 ///  
14 ///

15 **AYES: Bennett, Morgan, Tandon, van Overbeek, Winslow, Reynolds, Coolidge**

16 **NOES: None**

17 **ABSENT: None**


18 **ABSTAIN: None**

19 **DISQUALIFIED: None**

20 **ATTEST:**

21   
22 Deborah R. Presson, City Clerk

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

  
John W. Lam (Nov 21, 2023 15:21 PST)  
John W. Lam, City Attorney\*

\*Pursuant to The Charter of the  
City of Chico, Section 906(E)

## December 5, 2023 – City of Chico Council Meeting

Meeting minutes and video can be found here:

[https://chico-ca.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view\\_id=2](https://chico-ca.granicus.com/ViewPublisher.php?view_id=2)

### Active Transportation Plan Comments (Paraphrased)

#### Questions from Council

1. **Councilmember Winslow** - Great job, have never seen such robust public comment and engagement in a process like this. It is a very high-level process with a lot of detail.
  - a. **Question:** You mentioned one type of class III as a Bicycle Boulevard – could you explain a bicycle boulevard and how it differs from a class III and why we would propose just a class III and not a bicycle boulevard? One example is Ceanothus Ave – this goes right past the high school and is a class III bike route and not a boulevard. This is one where I was thinking it could be bumped up to a boulevard.
  - b. **Answer:** Bicycle boulevards include traffic calming as a part of a class III. We would propose a class III on a slower street, such as a residential street, or something that is lower in traffic stress. When we rated the streets for the level of traffic stress (rating the comfortability of a cyclist on a roadway alongside vehicles); a score of a 1 or 2 is something that is far more comfortable, less than 30 mph, usually residential, and would call for a class III. The reason we would recommend a class III boulevard vs. a class III bike route is that it would be (for example) a street that is closer to downtown, perhaps residential, could use traffic calming measures like a speed hump to slow the traffic down in addition to allowing the road space for a bicyclist to use. Some minor things about bike boulevards is that you would lessen the traffic controls for cyclists. If there are stop signs, you want the cyclist to have priority. They also tend to include wayfinding and serve as good connections for a trail system.
  - c. **Question:** A few more questions regarding crosswalks and protected bike lanes – In the survey, crosswalks, 62% of people said they were comfortable with high visibility markings and pedestrian refuge islands, and flashing beacons at 55%. I don't see a policy that requires improvements to crosswalks. This is a concern of mine because some recent project removed painted crosswalks; Park Ave, 15<sup>th</sup> Street, 17<sup>th</sup> Street, and 18<sup>th</sup> Street all had crosswalks prior to rehabilitation and they were lost. Is there anything in the Plan that could cause something like that to happen again? Or can a policy be added so that this doesn't happen again?
  - d. **Answer:** (Answered by Brendan Ottoboni) This is more of a traffic operations element and there are a lot of different factors. It is difficult to have an overarching policy that would say what to apply in specific situations because there are a lot of different applications and uniqueness to these scenarios. Park Ave is a major arterial roadway with higher volumes and speeds, so from a safety stand point, not wanting to put pedestrians in an unsafe condition where they are trying to cross a 5 lane roadway without a traffic control device is a safety concern. This must be studied on a project level to see where it makes sense. Providing crosswalks for pedestrians (and bicyclists) in a situation like this should be controlled to make it safe. This could be flashing beacons or midblock crossings – just some control to alert motorists that there is someone in the street/crossing that roadway.
  - e. **Question:** In other cities that you have worked in, have you seen similar policies that increase the level of priority of safe crossing, on a more general level?

- f. **Answer:** It's difficult to have a global policy because there are many factors to consider when implementing a project. In looking at the conditions during the time of the project being implemented, the city would consider opportunities to make the best bikeway possible, balancing the different priorities. I have seen circulation elements that promote the construction of the striping of crosswalks and the construction of ADA ramps, but there is hesitation to make global requirements and standards before you are able to uncover all the facts on the ground.
  - g. **Question:** In the survey, 91% said they would feel more comfortable separated from traffic. 77% said physical separation of a class IV would make them feel more comfortable. White painted buffer was 61%, dedicated bike lanes was 27%. These people likely ride bikes. There are a number of streets with class II on roads that are high stress, high traffic, and high-speed and without any upgrades at all [in the recommendations]. Notre Dame and Forest Ave are in the capital improvement plan. This is an opportunity upgrade these streets. Warner is another street; it is close to the university. We have policies in our General Plan that promote safer entrances into the university. Is there a reason that there are no upgrades proposed here and can we recommend the addition of some safer facilities?
2. **Councilmember Van Overbeek**
- a. **Comment:** May I suggest that this is not the venue to do the engineering at this level of detail? I really love the Plan. I am a cyclist, but I think this is a level of detail that needs to be worked out at a different venue.
3. **Councilmember Winslow**
- a. **Question:** Do you see opportunities [to upgrade] or did you find physical constraints that prevented you from upgrading these facilities (class IIs) that already exist?
  - b. **Answer:** There are multimodal conflicts and constraints on the busier roads. We want to make sure we connect people to low stress routes. For example, East Ave, with bike lanes, may never become comfortable for people to bike on. I think that is okay as long as there is redundancy in the system and a path of least resistance and comfort for all ages, so that is something that we wanted to accomplish through this project. The role of this Plan is not to recommend road diets everywhere, which is what would be needed to accomplish these facilities (Class IVs). There will need to be corridor-level specific studies to address that and look at the pros and cons [of different facility types], but I believe connectivity of the low stress network will help people to feel more comfortable and seek alternative ways to get around.

We put a few disclaimers in the Plan that any recommendations can be upgraded at any time based on safety need, feasibility studies, and public comment. A lot of projects will require more public engagement before they go out for a grant application, so at any point they can be upgraded to better facilities in that regard. There were many roads that we measured to see if projects were feasible (at a high level) and in some locations it [a class IV] just wasn't feasible. In those locations we did recommend class IIs.

### **Public Comment (Paraphrased)**

- 1. Anne Bykerk-Kauffman: I am a founding member of the Chico safe streets coalition. I've been riding my bike around Chico for 30 years plus and I use my bicycle primarily for transportation. I almost never drive anywhere and i'm lucky comma I live along lower Bidwell Park and I can use the park as my main thoroughfare. Not everybody is that lucky. A lot of people tell me they would

love to be able to do what I do, but there is no safe way for them to get from their house to where they need to go. So, I am really happy to see that the City is preparing this Active Transportation Plan, but I think we can be more ambitious than what the plan currently is. So, the most important change that the City could make to encourage active transportation and make the City better than it is would be to re-think the purpose of transportation infrastructure. I feel the purpose should be to facilitate human activities that maintain and enhance the quality of life for all residents of Chico and to not look at the transportation system as a way to move as many cars as possible, as fast as possible. One thing we could do is decide that all projects that involve repaving a road in Chico should make that street safe for bicyclist and pedestrians and all forms of active transportation, say adaptive handcycles. For example, the current transportation plan calls for a lot of painted bike lanes to be added, but many of those could be class IV, protected bikeways. We could beef it up. So, basically, what I am asking is, please do beef this up, pass it and implement it.

2. Rain Scher: As someone who has lived in this town for 19 years, more safety for bicyclists and pedestrians is super important and I support anything that increases that or increases the accessibility as much as possible for bicyclists and pedestrians. I have known countless people who have been hit and sometimes very seriously injured by vehicles while riding bicycles in downtown Chico. One of my friends had a severe head injury and was temporarily paralyzed and wheelchair bound for an extended period of time because she was hit on her bicycle in downtown Chico, so that's a serious problem. I would like to add to that – as much access to pedestrians and bicyclists as possible and minimizing car use and increasing more public transportation when possible. It's also really important that as we increase accessibility for bicycles and pedestrians who are walking, and places that are less accessible to cars are still accessible to disabled folks who are ambulatory impaired and use mobility devices.
3. Bill Monroe: What a great Plan and I hope you vote this in, so that's fantastic. I have a critique for the presentation. One of the first photo presentations was a woman smiling with no helmet I am a public health nurse and I have seen the results of bicycle accidents without helmet . I fell off a bicycle once with no helmet – the helmet was destroyed and my brain was not. There was another illustration later on toward the end of the presentation with a woman riding a bike in front of the university with no helmet. I recommend that the city always show images of people (who are getting on a bicycle or on a bicycle)with helmets on so we can normalize this behavior. Thank you.
4. Bruce McLean: I am a cyclist , I am also a member of the Chico Safe Streets Coalition. My vision of what I would like to see throughout Chico comes from my experience cycling through the Netherlands. You can cycle from one end of the Netherlands to the other on a protected bicycle only lane without ever coming in contact with a car. It's not surprising that 2/3rds of the Dutch people cycle. It also has health benefits – life extension, limited pollution. I am impressed with the program, but my vision is to have as many designated bike lanes (I feel safest on these). Many of the existing ones need to be repaved (Little Chico Creek). It is almost too difficult to cycle on because it is so bumpy and full of cracks. I encourage you to approve this Plan and put us in a position where we can seek external grant funds to improve our cycling network in Chico.

### Comments from Council

1. Councilmember Winslow –
  - a. **Question:** What would be the implications of providing further directions and delaying approval of the Plan?
  - b. **Answer:** (Brendan Ottoboni) time and consultant time requires more money. The intent of an adopted ATP is to be leveraged for grants, so we would be pushing up against potential future ATP applications. I think it is important to remember this is a planning level document that will be continuously updated. We can add to it. My personal

recommendation is to not delay it, but more, we can add commentary to it – comments received through this process will be in the appendices. This will be a living breathing document over time and we will be able to enhance it.

- c. **Question:** In the event we provided direction – would you rather we be specific about streets or general about upgrades we would like to see?
- d. **Answer:** Both can be used – especially as it relates to projects. Specific locations with specific treatments, but then there is also the opportunity to speak more globally to policies or general applications.



## Attachment D – Chico ATP Public Draft Proposed Comments for Document Incorporation

| Location in Document/ Context | Comment  | How comment was addressed  |
|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Page i                        | Add Staff Acknowledgement Page   | Added  |
| Page 1                        | Add clarification at the beginning of the document that states the recommended projects are subject to change depending on further feasibility review.   | Reiterated what is written in the implementation Plan:<br>As noted in the Implementation Plan chapter, recommendations made in this Plan may change over the years as the City begins to implement, especially if other safety needs arise or the City identifies safer options along particular corridors or within certain communities.  |
| Page 3                        | The second bullet under the GP section, maybe edit to “Prioritize a Complete Streets multimodal network, <b>when feasible</b> , to ensure safe travel for users.”  | Updated to say:<br>Prioritize a Complete Streets multimodal network to ensure safe travel for users, when feasible   |
| Page 5                        | Add expected kick off date for Toward an Active California Plan  | Added: This plan will be updated starting in 2024.   |
| Page 6                        | Photo could not fit once new text was added.   | Removed photo to add text and keep document pagination consistent.   |
| Page 6                        | City received comments that SR 32 needed to be included in the recommendations, but given jurisdiction, no recommendations were formally given in Plan.  | Added the following under Relationship to other Documents:<br>CALTRANS ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION PLANS<br>One action item Caltrans identified in the Toward an Active California document was to create an Active Transportation Plan for each Caltrans District. This effort, known as the Caltrans Active Transportation Plans (or CAT Plans), identified high priority corridors and specific locations for bicycle or pedestrian needs. In District 3, Caltrans identified that State Route 32 has “Tier 1” priority locations . Through the update of the Toward an Active California plan, Caltrans will identify how to further implement the CAT Plans in partnership with local agencies. |
| Page 18 and Page 115          | Update bikeway miles in table 5 and table 12   | Updated with most recent numbers provided by Chico Staff<br>Class I: 35.3<br>Class II: 40.1<br>Class III: 22.7<br>Class IV: Same   |
| Page 83                       | Action CIRC-2.1.2 (Retrofitting Existing Streets) – This action tells the City to update already-built roadways to streets designed to provide space for all travel modes, particularly to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety and enhance active transportation connectivity, <b>as funding allows</b> .<br><br>Add note regarding feasibility. | Updated: Action CIRC-2.1.2 (Retrofitting Existing Streets) – This action tells the City to update already-built roadways to streets designed to provide space for all travel modes, particularly to improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety and enhance active transportation connectivity, as funding allows and when feasible.   |

|                 |  |  |
|-----------------|--|--|
| Page 91         | Add description of 3rd Community Workshop - Public Draft Plan workshop   | Description of event added:<br><br>OCTOBER 19, 2023<br>The third and final workshop was held at City Hall from 5:00 to 7:00 PM and received comments on the Public Draft Plan. The final recommendations maps were placed around the room with printed copies of the Plan for people to review. Comments were generally supportive of the document with some making additional recommendations that were outside the scope of the Plan or could be implemented at a later time alongside other improvements. |
| page 115        | Table 12 outdated with update of existing bikeway miles on Table 5; Table 12 needs to be more concise.                         | Updated table to be consistent; Updated to be more concise. Combined bikeway facility types.   |
| Page 139        | Grammatical error  | Updated "The goal of evaluating projects is to build in flexibility into the improvement implementation guide as compatible opportunities arise." To "The goal of evaluating projects is to build flexibility into the improvement implementation guide as compatible opportunities arise."  |
| Page 145        | Point projects needed to be clarified that they can be combined with other projects  | The following was added at the end of paragraph 3 on page 145:<br>"Point projects may also be combined with each other to create standalone projects."   |
| Appendix        | Update table of contents to match appendices. Link appendices to table of contents   | Updated table of contents to match appendices  |
| Appendix        | Update page numbers throughout the document: Appendices A, C, D, E, F, and G.  | Updated page numbers throughout the document: Appendices A, C, D, E, F, and G.   |
| Appendix        | Add Articles from news coverage to appendix  | Added  |
| Appendix        | Typo on page 155 of the PDF of appendices for E 20 <sup>th</sup> St and Dr MLK Pkwy. Reduce is spelled as "rudeuce."           | Updated  |
| Appendix        | Appendix C - the text for the Facility Type and Crossing Improvement Type columns needs to be wrapped since the text is cutoff | Updated  |
| Appendix        | Update Appendix B with Stakeholder Engagement comments from third workshop and Public Draft Plan phase.                        | In Progress ( to be finalized after Council Meeting)   |
| Appendix        | Update Appendix B with additional news articles.   | Updated  |
| All Map Figures | Update SOI of all map figures  | Updated  |