

Michael Iza  
7190 Alameda Avenue  
Goleta, CA 93117  
805-453-9234  
mikeiza@cox.net

June 6, 2016

Mayor and Councilmembers  
City of Goleta  
130 Cremona Drive, Suite B  
Goleta, CA 93117

RE: Hollister Class I Bike Path Project Update, Agenda item D.4

Dear Mayor and Councilmembers:

We are again writing you as a voters, residents, homeowners, and parents who live in the City of Goleta. We applaud the City for prioritizing bicycle and pedestrian safety in the City of Goleta as it focuses its efforts on the Hollister corridor. While we are in support of the project, we are extremely disappointed that **NONE** of the essential safety features supported and approved by council in early 2015 (Alternative 2b) have been included in today's staff report to council. Another disappointment with this project is the extended timeline that has not allowed this project to move forward in a timely manner.

Our main concerns are as follows:

1) At the March 3<sup>rd</sup> 2015 Council meeting, the Council majority strongly supported staff to ensure that the safety features the public proposed were included in the final design, which was approved as "Alternative 2b".

Between March 2015 and the present (15 months), staff has concluded that none of the proposed Alternative 2b safety features can be included in this current design proposal. To begin, today's staff report shows what is described as "Typical Bend Out Design with Speed Table", which is different to the one Council was shown in Alternative 2b in 2015. Staff does not explain if this was the design proposed by the consultant or the one used in the staff analysis. The staff report only provides a brief statement that the bend out design was not safe as deemed by staff. Simply stating: *"...Both traffic engineers agreed that sight distance restrictions due to adjacent homes and fencing created potential hazards and determined that "bend outs" were not viable at either location"*. No additional evidence was provided. Since there was no further information, it is impossible to comment as to why this design was not safe and if there are any design changes that would make this design possible. Lastly, if the design was deemed not safe, why not direct the consultant for a redesign to address staff concerns? We request that staff provide additional

evidence that was used to reach the conclusion that the bend out design is infeasible as well as explore alternatives to ensure this safety design feature is included in the final design.

2) The staff report also states that: "*the speed table option could not accommodate the existing drainage patterns without redesigning the drainage along this stretch of Hollister and constructing new drainage facilities*". Again, staff did not produce any concept drawings and simply stated that this was something that was simply not possible. We request that staff provide additional evidence that demonstrates infeasibility of this design option that was supported by Council and the public at the March 2015 meeting. In addition, if the current drainage facilities will make this design feature infeasible, we request that the City identify funds necessary in order to incorporate this crucial safety feature.

3) Furthermore, staff states that they would like to use project funds in order to resurface Hollister Avenue. How does the use of these funds to resurface Hollister mesh with establishing a bike path? This is especially concerning because a "lack of funds" reasoning was stated as a reason to not include the "speed table" type of crosswalk safety feature described earlier. We request council designate the funding for this project to be used for the sole purpose of making Alternative 2b as safe as possible and not to be used for general "road improvement" projects such as resurfacing Hollister Avenue as proposed by staff.

Since staff has dismissed each of Alternative 2b's safety enhancements with scant evidence, does council still support a safer route to school for the children and residents of Goleta?

In summary, this critical bike path will be mainly used by young Ellwood Elementary students and we emphasize the importance of all the safety features associated with Alternative 2b that were unanimously supported by Council on March 2015. These features are not just "nice to haves" but **MUST HAVES**. If we are truly building this project in order to increase safety for cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists, why does this design still not address the areas that cause the majority of pedestrian-car collisions (safety at intersections)? We respectfully request that Council defer finalization of the design until these issues have been properly addressed and implemented.

Warmest regards,

Michael Iza, Goleta Resident, Cyclist and Parent

*Additionally Signed:*

David Abel, Ellwood Resident and Parent

Tamra Abel, Ellwood Resident and Parent

Timothy Burgess, Ellwood Resident and Parent

Mandy Burgess, Ellwood Resident and Parent

Terra Anne Hillyer, Goleta Resident and Parent

Sara Iza, Goleta Resident, Cyclist and Parent

Heather Shea, Goleta Resident and Parent

Loretta Smargon, Goleta Resident, Director of Evergreen Learning Center (Goleta Preschool)