

## REPORT TO GENERAL PLAN 2040 STEERING COMMITTEE

**Subject: Discussion of Mobility (Circulation) Element, Policy Audit, and Future Measurement of Transportation Impacts**

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Agenda Item 5.B addresses the 2040 General Plan Mobility Element, which will replace the “Circulation” Element of General Plan 2020. There are three main objectives for the Steering Committee meeting:

- (1) Provide an overview of what is in the existing General Plan, and solicit Committee member feedback on existing policies
- (2) Discuss potential new policies in response to emerging issues and conditions
- (3) Review issues associated with Senate Bill 743, which changes the way cities may measure transportation impacts in Environmental Impact Reports, including the General Plan and Downtown Precise Plan EIR

A matrix evaluating the policies in the existing Circulation Element has been included at the end of this report.

### REPORT

#### Background

California Government Code requires every California general plan to include a “Circulation” Element. According to State law, the Element must address *“the general location and extent of existing and proposed major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, any military airports and ports, and other local public utilities and facilities, all correlated with the land use element of the plan.”* (Government Code 65302(b))

The Government Code further requires that the Element *“plan for a balanced, multi-modal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads, and highways for safe and convenient travel in a manner that is suitable to the rural, suburban, or urban context.”* The Code further states that the “users” of streets, roads, and highways refers to *“bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, users of public transportation, and seniors.”*

The California General Plan Guidelines state that Circulation Elements must address the relationship between transportation and land use, the environment, and health. The Guidelines also call for Circulation Elements to address emerging transportation solutions (carshare, rideshare, bikeshare), the impacts of technology, and recent legislation requiring that streets are designed to accommodate all modes of travel and not motor vehicles alone. Circulation Elements must be consistent with regional transportation plans, address the transportation needs of disadvantaged communities, improve connections for pedestrians and bicycles, and protect residents from the potentially harmful effects of transportation facilities and vehicles. Capital costs, operating costs, and maintenance costs also must be addressed.

One of the required attributes of the Circulation Element is that it must balance all modes of travel, rather than being principally focused on auto speed and convenience. Thus, much of the policy focus is on making it easier and safer to walk, bicycle, and use public transit. Other transportation issues addressed by the Element include traffic calming, traffic safety and collisions, goods movement (trucks, water, etc.), airports, and parking. Perhaps more than any other element of the Plan, the Circulation Element must consider the impacts of technology, including autonomous vehicles, intelligent highway systems, and “disruptive” travel modes like Uber/Lyft and electric scooters.

### **What’s in the Circulation Element Now?**

The General Plan 2020 Circulation Element can be reviewed [here](#). The Element begins with a summary of key recommendations, which include specific capital improvements, safety measures, and transportation demand management strategies. The Element then includes background information on transportation in San Rafael, including data on travel patterns, commuting, traffic volumes, recent projects, and forecasts for the future. This is followed by a discussion of circulation needs in the city, organized by travel mode. The relationship between the Circulation Element and other Elements of the General Plan is then explained.

The remainder of the Element presents seven goals for transportation. Under these goals are 33 policies and 63 action programs. The goal titles are as follows:

- A Leadership Role in Transportation
- Mobility for All Users
- Safe and Efficient Streets
- Connections Between Neighborhoods
- Bikeways
- Pedestrian Paths
- Adequate Parking

Most of the policies and programs fall under the second goal, which addresses mobility for all users. This goal covers a broad range of topics related to the operation and design of the road system, congestion management, public transit, and provisions for each mode of travel. The other goals are typically focused on a single topic, such as parking or bicycle circulation.

The second goal also describes in detail the methods that San Rafael uses to measure and manage roadway congestion and collect developer fees for transportation improvements. Maps in the Circulation Element show the primary network of streets and the classification of each roadway (which is used to determine road design standards). A list of needed improvements and their costs is included.

In addition to expanding the capacity of the road network to handle more traffic, the Circulation Element explores ways to reduce congestion by improving other modes of travel. An extensive set of policies encourages “alternative” transportation modes and reduced trips during the peak commute hours through telecommuting, flextime, and similar measures. A significant number of policies focuses on public transportation, including local and regional buses, ferries, SMART rail, and paratransit.

The matrix that follows this staff report includes an Audit of the goals, policies, and programs in this Element. Column 1 of the Audit provides the verbatim language from the existing (2020) General Plan. Column 2 provides staff’s evaluation of each goal, policy, and program. Column 3 is “blank” and provides space for each member of the General Plan 2040 Steering Committee to weigh in. Committee members may comment on either the policy itself or staff’s commentary. We will compile all Committee comments as we rewrite and update the policies over the coming months. **Steering Committee member comments are due on June 30, 2019.**

## Other Plans

Preparing the new Mobility Element will require integration of related recent plans and programs addressing transportation in San Rafael. Links to some of the key documents are provided below:

- [2019 Climate Change Action Plan](#) was adopted by the City Council on May 6, 2019. It includes a number of transportation-related measures aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.
- [2018 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan](#) was adopted by the City Council on July 16, 2018. It updates a prior plan and guides investment in pedestrian and bicycle facilities for the next 5 to 10 years.
- [Third Street Rehabilitation Project Final Report](#) was presented to the City Council on June 3, 2019. This is a study report to improve the operation and design of 3<sup>rd</sup> Street through Downtown San Rafael.
- [Third and Hetherton Traffic Study](#) looks specifically at this intersection and includes five options addressing pedestrian safety improvements.
- [San Rafael/ Bettini Transit Center Replacement Project](#) examines options for relocating the existing transit center in Downtown San Rafael to accommodate the SMART train alignment that passes through the site. The hyperlink is to the Environmental Scoping Report (1/19), which outlines alternative locations for the new Center and describes the project.

In addition to these plans, both Marin Transit and Golden Gate Transit (GGBHTD) maintain short-range plans expressing service priorities and improvements through the mid 2020s. In addition, the Transportation Authority of Marin (TAM) has prepared a [“Vision” Plan](#) (2017) which provides aspirational goals for the future, including a framework for long-range transportation planning.

Additional plans exist at the regional level through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, and various regional agencies.

## CHANGES TO HOW TRANSPORTATION IMPACTS ARE MEASURED

On June 3, 2019, City staff provided an informational report to the City Council on the effects of new State laws on how cities in California may measure and mitigate the traffic impacts of new development. Interested Committee members may review the [staff report](#) by clicking the hyperlinked text. The webcast/video of the presentation, including Council member comments, can be viewed [here](#) (scroll to Agenda Item 6a). A brief summary is provided below.

Since 1983, San Rafael has relied on a measurement called Level of Service (LOS) to evaluate the transportation impacts of developments and changes to roads. LOS is based on the number of vehicles that can travel through an intersection (or on a road segment) in a given time. It is expressed with a letter grade ranging from A to F. A road operating at LOS “A” has no congestion, with traffic moving at the speed limit or experiencing minimal delays at intersections. A road operating at LOS “F” is considered to be failing, with gridlock conditions or long delays at intersections.

Many suburban cities, including San Rafael, have adopted LOS “D” as their planning standard. Roads operating at this standard are moderately congested at rush hour, but delays are tolerable and are usually limited to commute times. In many cities, LOS “E” has been deemed acceptable at Downtown intersections and at specific intersections that are already very congested during the rush hour, with roads cannot realistically be widened any further.

When San Rafael adopted General Plan 2000 in 1988, the LOS concept was memorialized as the standard for determining the threshold for determining whether a development project had a “significant impact” on traffic under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). A traffic mitigation fee was adopted, with funds used to undertake improvements to mitigate future impacts. The existing General Plan includes a list of transportation improvements to address growth-related impacts. Typical projects include new signals, new turning lanes, and realigning roads.

By the early 2000s, the use of LOS for planning purposes appeared to be in conflict with emerging statewide transportation and environmental goals. As growth occurs, maintaining a particular LOS requires increasing road capacity. This enables more driving, which contributes to carbon emissions. Expanding road capacity also fosters more auto-oriented communities, often making it more difficult to balance all modes of travel and meet the transportation needs of all individuals.

Given the growing concern about greenhouse gas emissions, the California legislature encouraged policy makers and regulators to a shift away from planning for more auto capacity, and instead look at ways to reduce driving. Strategies such as transit-oriented development and higher density infill development were encouraged to shorten commute lengths and divert trips to other modes of travel. The favored tool for measuring the effectiveness of such strategies is “Vehicle Miles Traveled” (VMT). VMT relates to the total miles driven each day to and from a given property or activity. Unlike LOS, VMT does not assess a project’s impacts on a local intersection or road/highway segment. Rather, it assesses the effects of the project on regional traffic and its ability to shift trips to other modes of transportation.

In 2013, Governor Brown signed Senate Bill 743 (SB 743). This included a prohibition on the use of LOS for evaluating a project's environmental impact under CEQA. Projects are instead evaluated on their ability to reduce per capita VMT compared to the regional average. Instead of measuring whether or not a project causes travel delays or makes it harder to drive, cities must now measure whether or not a project contributes to other state goals, like reducing greenhouse gas emissions, improving transit, preserving open space, and promoting diverse land uses and infill development.

As part of General Plan 2040, the City will need to develop a traffic model that incorporates VMT projections for new development. It will also need to develop new measures to reduce per capita increases in VMT, such as carpooling programs, bike lanes, and housing near job centers.

Under SB 743, cities are not barred from using LOS for planning purposes. They simply may not use it as a standard to determine if a project has a significant impact on the environment. SB 743 also does not affect a city's ability to collect traffic mitigation fees, providing that the fees are linked to necessary transportation improvements identified in the General Plan and are supported by a "nexus" study. San Rafael now must decide whether it will maintain two different standards for transportation planning (LOS and VMT), or whether it will shift entirely to a VMT-based system for traffic planning. Other cities in California are also facing this decision and are choosing a variety of paths forward.

A number of options have been developed for discussion. As noted above, these were presented to the City Council for discussion on June 3, 2019. Our transportation planning consultant (Fehr and Peers) will provide an overview of these options at the Steering Committee meeting on June 12. Although the chosen strategy will ultimately be a City Council decision, input from the Steering Committee can help inform Council deliberations. Information on the options under consideration are included in the Council staff report at the hyperlink above.

## KEY QUESTIONS FOR COMMITTEE

Steering Committee discussion should focus on the following topics:

- Are there goals and policies in the existing Circulation Element you feel need to be revised?
- Are there new goals, policies or action programs that should be added?
- What feedback would you like to provide the City Council as they discuss the issue of measuring future transportation impacts?

## ATTACHMENTS

The 2019 Circulation Element Policy Audit follows this report.

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>GOAL 12</b>	<p><b>A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN TRANSPORTATION</b>            It is the goal of San Rafael to take a leadership role in developing regional transportation solutions. <i>San Rafael is proud of the leadership role it has taken in planning and securing funding for regional transportation projects that expand travel choices for local citizens. Through working closely with regional transportation planning agencies, funding sources and service providers, the City continues to play a pivotal role in making highway connections more efficient, improving bus service, establishing commuter rail service, expanding ferry service, and creating an extensive Countywide bikeway network.</i></p>	<p>Carry goal forward. As the county seat and largest city in Marin County, it is appropriate for the City to be a regional leader in transportation planning.</p>	
<b>Policy C-1</b>	<p><b>Regional Transportation Planning</b>            Actively coordinate with other jurisdictions, regional transportation planning agencies, and transit providers to expand and improve local and regional transportation choice. Work cooperatively to improve transit and paratransit services, achieve needed highway corridor improvements, and improve the regional bicycling network. As part of this effort, support implementation of Marin County’s <i>25-Year Transportation Vision</i>.</p>	<p>Carry policy forward. Delete last sentence (use Program C-1a below to refer the specific long-range plan to be implemented over the next two decades).</p>	
<b>Program C-1a</b>	<p><b>Participation in CMA, MTC and Other Regional Transportation Planning Efforts.</b> <i>Continue to participate in and monitor activities of regional transportation planning agencies, including but not limited to the Transportation Authority of Marin and the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, and actively support implementation of Marin County’s 25-Year Transportation Vision.</i></p>	<p>Carry action forward. Change reference in last sentence to the Transportation Authority of Marin’s Strategic Vision Plan.</p>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT



Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Program C-1b</b>	<b>Public Information About Transportation.</b> <i>Through public workshops, neighborhood meetings, staff reports and other means, provide public information and education on local transportation conditions, behavior, issues and improvement options. Hold at least one traffic and transportation workshop annually to update the public on conditions and proposed improvements.</i>	<i>Still relevant and applicable. Carry forward as is.</i>	
<b>Policy C-2</b>	<b>Regional Transportation Funding</b> Support a regional funding approach to pay for transportation improvements to transit, highway corridors, and bicycle routes and facilities by seeking a broad range of federal, state and local funds to help pay for these improvements. Use locally generated funds to leverage/match outside funding sources.	Policy remains relevant as written. Carry forward.	
<i>Program C-2b (2-a was deleted)</i>	<b>Transportation Project Grants.</b> <i>Work with governmental agencies, non-profits and community groups to secure grants for appropriate transportation projects.</i>	Still relevant and applicable. Potentially add language to improve mobility for disadvantaged communities.	
<b>Policy C-3</b>	<b>Seeking Transportation Innovation</b> Take a leadership role in looking for opportunities to be innovative and experiment with transportation improvements and services.	Simplify: "Take a leadership role in the use of innovative transportation technology and services."	
<i>Program C-3a</i>	<b>Transportation Technology.</b> <i>Use the most effective technologies in managing the City's roadways and congestion. For example, support timed connections at transit hubs, and promote the use of transportation information systems.</i>	<i>Still relevant and applicable. Potentially update last sentence to reflect current best practices in transportation technology and smart city design.</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>GOAL 13</b>	<b>MOBILITY FOR ALL USERS</b> It is the goal of San Rafael to have a diversified, cost-effective and resource-efficient transportation network that provides mobility for all users. Our transportation system is safe and responsive to the needs of San Rafael residents, workers and visitors. It provides a range of travel options that include improved highway and roadway connections, expanded bus service, new commuter rail, smaller scale transit options responsive to special populations, and an excellent network of bikeways and pedestrian paths. Our transit and paratransit systems effectively serve a broad spectrum of users, including commuters, youth, seniors and people with disabilities. Our roadways and parking resources are efficiently managed and accommodate automobiles as well as alternative modes of transportation. San Rafael continues to monitor and limit its local congestion levels using traffic standards.	<p>This goal remains valid and continues to reflect best practices in transportation planning.</p> <p>Given that there are 7 goals in this Element and 2/3 of the policies fall under <u>this</u> goal, perhaps this needs to be divided into two goals (and other goals need to be consolidated). The first goal would address operation of the circulation system and congestion management. The second would focus on reducing reduce vehicle miles traveled, consistent with the Climate Action Plan and best practices in transportation planning.</p> <p>Also, replace the last sentence as follows: “San Rafael continues to monitor its local congestion levels and implement programs to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.”</p>	
<b>Policy C-4</b>	<b>Safe Roadway Design</b> Design of roadways should be safe and convenient for motor vehicles, transit, bicycles and pedestrians. Place highest priority on safety. In order to maximize safety and multimodal mobility, the City Council may determine that an intersection is exempt from the applicable intersection level of service standard where it is determined that a circulation improvement is needed for public safety considerations, including bicycle and pedestrian safety, and/or transit use improvements.	<p>Adjust third sentence as needed depending on outcome of Level of Service discussion.</p> <p>Possible alternate wording: “Higher levels of congestion may be accepted at particular intersections if necessary for environmental and public safety considerations, including bicycle and pedestrian safety, and/or transit use improvements.”</p>	
<i>Program C-4a</i>	<b>Street Pattern and Traffic Flow.</b> Support efforts by the City Traffic Engineer to configure or re-configure street patterns so as to improve traffic flow and turning movements in balance with safety considerations and the desire not to widen roads.	<p>Program is acceptable as shown—though this is more of a policy than a program.</p> <p>Potentially merge with C-4b?</p>	



# CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<i>Program C-4b</i>	<b>Street Design Criteria to Support Alternative Modes.</b> <i>Establish street design criteria to the extent permitted by State law to support alternative transportation modes to better meet user needs and minimize conflicts between competing modes.</i>	Add explicit reference to “Complete Streets” per AB 1358 requirements.	
 <i>Program C-4c</i>	<b>Appropriate LOS Standards.</b> <i>At the time City Council approves a roadway improvement and safety exemption from the applicable LOS standard, the appropriate LOS will be established for the intersection.</i>	Edit pending Council direction on how LOS will be handled in General Plan 2040.	
 <b>Policy C-5-part A</b>	<p><b>Traffic Level of Service Standards.</b></p> <p><b>A. Intersection LOS.</b> In order to ensure an effective roadway network, maintain adequate traffic levels of service (LOS) consistent with standards for signalized intersections in the A.M. and P.M. peak hours as shown below, except as provided for under (B) Arterial LOS.</p> <p><b>Intersection Level of Service Standards, A.M. and P.M. Peak Hours Location (LOS)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Citywide, except as noted below (D)</i></li> <li>• <i>Downtown, except as noted below (E)</i></li> <li>• <i>Mission Ave and Irwin (F)</i></li> <li>• <i>Irwin and Grand b/w 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> (E)</i></li> <li>• <i>Third and Union (E, with 70 second max delay at peak hrs)</i></li> <li>• <i>Anderson at W Francisco, and at Bellam (F)</i></li> <li>• <i>Freitas at Civic/Redwood (E)</i></li> <li>• <i>Merrydale at Las Gallinas and at Civic Ctr (E)</i></li> </ul>	<p>Future of this policy depends on Council direction to either retain LOS as a planning metric or shift to VMT or another metric for measuring the performance of the transportation network and collecting fees/programming improvements.</p> <p>In the event LOS is maintained as a planning metric, the list to the left should be updated based on projected 2040 conditions. The limitations of using LOS for CEQA should be noted in the policy.</p>	



*Star indicates this policy/program will be impacted by ongoing discussions about how the City measures traffic system performance in the future*

**CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT**





Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<p><b>Policy C-5 part B</b></p>	<p><b>B. Arterial LOS.</b> The City Traffic Engineer may apply arterial level of service analysis as the primary method of analysis for any proposed development project. The City Traffic Engineer will make this determination based on intersection spacing and other characteristics of the roadway system where conditions are better predicted by arterial analysis. Where arterial LOS analysis is warranted, a proposed development must be consistent with the following arterial LOS standards. If an intersection LOS is above or below the standard, the project shall be considered consistent with this policy if the arterial LOS is within the standard. The project will not be deemed consistent with this policy if the arterial LOS fails to meet the standard.</p> <p>When arterial level of service is applied as the primary method of analysis for a proposed project, the project shall be deemed to be consistent with this policy if it is demonstrated that the arterial LOS standards described below are met regardless of the intersection LOS, or the project shall be deemed to be inconsistent with this policy if the arterial LOS standards are not met regardless of the intersection LOS.</p> <p><b>Arterial Level of Service Standards, A.M. and P.M. Peak Hours Location (LOS)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Citywide, except as shown below (D)</i></li> <li>• <i>Downtown, except as noted below (E)</i></li> <li>• <i>Congestion Management Segments (Second, Third and Fourth Streets) (as established by the Marin County Congestion Management Agency) (D)</i></li> <li>• <i>Arterials operating at LOS E outside Downtown and F as of adoption date of GP 2020, per Appendix C.</i></li> </ul>	<p>See comment above. In the event that LOS is retained as a planning metric, confirm that it is still acceptable to use arterial delays (rather than intersection delays) as an alternative way to determine the potential impacts of a development project. Under what circumstances should arterial LOS be used instead of intersection LOS?</p> <p>Note that regardless of the approach, the text highlighted in yellow at left should be rewritten. It is confusing, with some redundancy between the two paragraphs. If LOS is retained, the consequences of an “inconsistency” determination will need to be spelled out. Pursuant to SB 743, the City may no longer deny a project under CEQA if the LOS fails to meet the City’s standard.</p> <p>If LOS is retained, the arterial LOS standards shown at left will need to be updated based on the 2040 forecasts.</p> <p>References to the Marin County CMA should be replaced with references to the Transportation Authority of Marin.</p>	


## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
★ <b>Policy C-5, pt C and D</b>	<p><b>C. Exemptions.</b> Signalized intersections at Highway 101 and Interstate 580 on-ramps and off-ramps are exempt from LOS standards because delay at these locations is affected by regional traffic and not significantly impacted by local measures.</p> <p><b>D. Evaluation of Project Merits.</b> In order to balance the City’s objectives to provide affordable housing, maintain a vital economy and provide desired community services with the need to manage traffic congestion, projects that would exceed the level of service standards set forth above may be approved if the City Council finds that the benefits of the project to the community outweigh the resulting traffic impacts.</p>	<p>Confirm that exemptions as stated are still appropriate and carry forward.</p> <p>Suggest pulling out Clause “D” and reframing it as a separate policy (merged with Program C-5c below). Per SB 743, the City may not be able to deny a project because it exceeds adopted LOS standards. Rather than finding that the benefits outweigh the impacts, the policy should focus on how the project will incorporate measures to reduce increases in Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and associated greenhouse gas emissions.</p>	
★ <b>Program C-5a</b>	<b>LOS Methodology.</b> Use appropriate methodologies for calculating traffic Levels of Service, as determined by the City Traffic Engineer.	Replace with new program that reflects City Council direction and state requirements on how the performance of the road network should be measured.	
<b>Program C-5b</b>	<b>Monitoring Traffic.</b> To assure acceptable traffic operating standards over time, monitor traffic conditions throughout San Rafael on an ongoing basis. Based on such evaluation, the City Traffic Engineer shall identify traffic mitigations to reduce congestion and address safety concerns.	This remains valid and should be carried forward. Add language on the use of technology to track this data more intelligently and to use the data to inform improvement plans and safety measures.	
★ <b>Program C-5c</b>	<b>Exception Review.</b> When the City Council finds that a project provides significant community benefits yet would result in a deviation from the LOS standards, the City Council may approve such a project through adoption of findings, based on substantial evidence, that the specific economic, social, technological and/or other benefits of the project to the community substantially outweigh the project’s impacts on circulation, and that all feasible mitigation measures have been required of the project.	This basically repeats Clause D in Policy C-5 above. Suggest creating a new policy that merges both and provides guidance for exceeding adopted standards (if standards are retained in the General Plan).	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
 <p><b>Policy C-5.1</b></p>	<p><b>Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Methodology for Environmental Review of Traffic Impact</b></p> <p>Pursuant to Public Resources Code § 21099 and 21083 (provided under Senate Bill 743, effective January 2016,) an alternative method for measuring transportation impacts of projects will replace the Level of Service (LOS) methodology. For environmental review, the use of the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) metric will be applied in assessing development projects.</p>	<p>This was intended as a placeholder policy during the last round of General Plan Amendments. It should be replaced with a new policy that explains how traffic impacts will be measured under CEQA for future development projects.</p>	
 <p><b>Program C-5.1.a</b></p>	<p><i>Develop a VMT Model. Use VMT in the assessment of traffic impacts for the purposes of environmental review, provided that each project meets the criteria for use of VMT measurements identified under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and that the City Traffic Engineer determines the appropriateness of using VMT for a project.</i></p> <p><i>a. Develop and adopt a VMT model. Incorporate the model into the General Plan Environmental Impact Report</i></p> <p><i>b. Implement VMT for CEQA review of projects</i></p>	<p><i>Replace with a new program that explains how VMT will be measured and monitored, and how project impacts will be mitigated.</i></p>	

# CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
 <p><b>Policy C-6</b></p>	<p><b>Proposed Improvements</b></p> <p>The proposed circulation improvements in Exhibit 21 have been identified as potentially needed to improve safety and relieve congestion in San Rafael over the next 20 years. Major Proposed Circulation Improvements include those improvements deemed necessary to maintain City LOS standards. Other recommended roadway improvements, include additional improvements that may become necessary in the long-term and are desirable to enhance San Rafael’s circulation system, but are not necessary to maintain LOS standards. Specific improvements will be implemented as conditions require and will be refined during the design phase. Recognize that other feasible design solutions may become available and be more effective in achieving the same goals as the improvements listed in Exhibit 19, and allow for their implementation, consistent with the most recent engineering standards. As conditions change, planned roadway improvements may be amended, through the annual General Plan Review. Roadway improvements are implemented through the Capital Improvements Program, and are typically funded through a variety of sources, including Traffic Mitigation Fees. Environmental review is required.</p>	<p>Intent of this policy remains valid, but it should be shorter. Basically, the policy should indicate that the Exhibit shows recommended road improvements, and is subject to refinement based on changing traffic patterns, technology, and transportation planning practices.</p> <p>Exhibit 21 will be updated through the General Plan Update. Implementation measures should include regular review of the project list and updates to development impact fees.</p> <p>Reference to Exhibit 19 should be to Exhibit 21.</p> <p>Last sentence seems to be just hanging out there?</p>	
<p><b>Program C-6a</b></p>	<p><b>Update Proposed Circulation Improvements.</b> On a regular basis, monitor and update the list of Proposed Circulation Improvements.</p>	<p><i>Still valid. Carry forward. Potentially explain how the list should be updated (based on traffic counts? Modeling? Collision data? Travel delay index? Available funds? Etc.)</i></p>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Policy C-7</b>	<p><b>Circulation Improvement Funding</b></p> <p>Take a strong advocacy role in securing funding for planned circulation improvements. Continue to seek comprehensive funding that includes Federal, State, and County funding, among other funding sources; Local Traffic Mitigation Fees; and Assessment Districts. The local development projects' share of responsibility to fund improvements is based on: (1) the generation of additional traffic that creates the need for the improvement; (2) the improvement's role in the overall traffic network; (3) the probability of securing funding from alternative sources; and (4) the timing of the improvement.</p>	<p>This is really two separate policies rolled into one. They remain valid, but could be presented as follows:</p> <p>(1) A policy on advocacy for funding and pursuit of grants, fees, and other funding sources.</p> <p>(2) A policy on how developer contributions are calculated.</p>	
<b>Program C-7a</b>	<p><b>Traffic Mitigation Fees.</b> Continue to implement and periodically update the City's Traffic Mitigation Program.</p>	<p><i>Remains valid. Carry forward. Update as needed as the General Plan process continues.</i></p>	
<b>Program C-7b</b>	<p><b>Circulation Improvements.</b> Seek funding for and construct circulation improvements needed for safety, to improve circulation, or to maintain traffic level of service.</p>	<p><i>Already covered by Policy C-7. Is there a more specific action that can be prescribed for obtaining transportation funds following GP adoption?</i></p>	
<b>Policy C-8</b>	<p><b>Eliminating and Shifting Peak Hour Trips</b></p> <p>Support efforts to limit traffic congestion through eliminating low occupancy auto trips or shifting peak hour trips to off-peak hours. Possible means include telecommuting, walking and bicycling, flexible work schedules, car and vanpooling and other Transportation Demand Management approaches.</p>	<p>Remains relevant. Carry forward. Also address positive impacts of these measures on vehicle miles traveled.</p>	
<b>Policy C-9</b>	<p><b>Access for Emergency Services</b></p> <p>Provide safe routes for emergency vehicle access so that that emergency services can be delivered when Highway 101 or 580 are closed or congested with traffic.</p>	<p>Remains valid. Carry forward. Cross-reference Environmental Hazards policies on evacuation and emergency vehicle response.</p>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Program C-9a</b>	<b>Highway Closures.</b> Develop, and update as necessary, an emergency contingency plan that addresses highway closure events.	Status? Check with Fire and Public Works and delete if this has been superseded by other emergency preparedness actions.	
<b>Program C-9b</b>	<b>Roadway Monitoring.</b> Support local traffic monitoring and control approaches, such as closed-circuit cameras and high-tech traffic signal systems that can be used to relieve congestion around incident sites or support emergency vehicle access.	Carry forward. Tie to use of technology to improve roadway efficiency and operations.	
<b>Policy C-10</b>	<b>Alternative Transportation Mode Projects</b> Encourage and support projects, such as the Highway 101 High Occupancy Vehicle Gap Closure Project, that benefit alternatives to the single occupant automobile.	The referenced project has been completed, but the City continues to support projects that encourage ridesharing and other alternative modes. A general policy supporting such projects should continue to be included in the Plan.	
<b>Program C-10a</b>	<b>Advocating Alternative Mode Projects.</b> Through the City's participation in the CMA and other regional transportation agencies, advocate for innovative and alternative transportation projects that will reduce single occupancy vehicle use.	Remains relevant. Can carry forward. Note that the goal is not only to reduce single occupancy vehicle use, it is also to reduce trip length and encourage electric and alternative fuel vehicles.	
<b>Policy C-11</b>	<b>Alternative Transportation Mode Users</b> Encourage and promote individuals to use alternative modes of transportation, such as regional and local transit, carpooling, bicycling, walking and use of low-impact alternative vehicles. Support development of programs that provide incentives for individuals to choose alternative modes.	Clarify "low impact alternative vehicles" = non-gasoline powered? Potentially merge Policy C-10 and C-11, and update with actions from the most recent Climate Change Action Plan.	
<b>Program C-11a</b>	<b>Car and Vanpooling.</b> Support car and vanpooling in San Rafael through local and regional programs that match riders interested in carpooling or vanpooling.	Remains relevant. Carry forward. Frame as one component of a series of Transportation Demand Management measures aimed at reducing vehicle miles traveled.	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<i>Program C-11b</i>	<b>Car Sharing.</b> Support efforts to organize and run car-sharing programs in San Rafael.	Remains relevant. Carry forward. Add bike-sharing, on-demand vehicles (e., Zipcar, etc.). Plan will also need to address the role of Transportation Network Companies (Uber and Lyft) as well as shared bikes and scooters.	
<b>Program C-11c</b>	<b>Low-Impact Alternative Vehicles.</b> Encourage the use of street-legal alternative vehicles that minimize impacts on the environment. Investigate new technology regarding electric vehicles and cleaner burning combustion vehicles. To support this program, encourage the development of alternative fuel infrastructure (for instance, electric plug-ins) in parking facilities and other key locations around the City as well as, when cost-effective, include electric, hybrid, or alternative fuel vehicles in the City fleet.	Remains relevant, but most recent Climate Action Plan provides more specific direction on electric vehicle incentives and infrastructure (charging stations, etc.).	
<b>Program C-11d</b>	<b>Bike to Work Day.</b> Encourage City employees, other San Rafael workers and residents to participate in Bike to Work Days and similar programs and provide support services for the program.	Move to the Goal on cycling (Goal 16) and frame as one of several strategies that encourage and support bicycle use.	
<b>Program C-11e</b>	<b>Reduction of Single Occupancy Vehicles.</b> Encourage developers of new projects in San Rafael, including City projects, to provide improvements that reduce the use of single occupancy vehicles. These improvements could include preferential parking spaces for car pools, bicycle storage and parking facilities, and bus stop shelters.	“Encourage” may not be strong enough. Given state mandates to reduce VMT, some of these improvements may need to be mandatory (e.g., bicycle storage and parking). Revisit as part of broader transportation demand management discussion.	
<b>Policy C-12</b>	<b>Transportation Demand Management.</b> Work cooperatively with governmental agencies, non-profits, businesses, institutions and residential neighborhoods to create new and effective Transportation Demand Management (TDM) programs to minimize single occupancy automobile use and peak period traffic demand.	Good. Critical policy to reduce congestion and vehicle miles traveled. Carry forward.	



## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Program C-12a</b>	<b>Regional Support for TDM.</b> Support regional efforts to work with employers to provide TDM programs.	Remains relevant. Carry forward.	
<b>Program C-12b</b>	<b>City Support for TDM.</b> Serve as a resource to employers wishing to implement TDM by providing information through printed materials, workshops and other means. Encourage smaller employers to “pool” resources to create effective TDM programs.	Remains relevant. Look at “best practices” in TDM to consider other ways to promote and advance.	
<b>Program C-12c</b>	<b>City TDM Program.</b> Identify cost-effective City of San Rafael TDM programs for City employees. Consider approaches taken by the County in its Employee Commute Alternative Program.	Carry forward. The County’s program is called “RideGreen”. Also reference other types of TDM programs that might be implemented locally. Employer shuttles? Downtown Circulator?	
<b>Policy C-13</b>	<b>School-Related Automobile Traffic.</b> Actively encourage public and private schools to implement trip reduction programs and reduce congestion caused by commuting students and staff.	Remains valid. Potentially move to next goal? (more of a neighborhood and safety issue than a congestion issue?)	
<b>Program C-13a</b>	<b>School Transportation.</b> Actively support efforts to improve transportation options for students and reduce school-related traffic congestion. Examples include advocating for funding for the Safe Routes to Schools program, encouraging transit providers to offer free passes or awards to students to use transit, supporting increased funding of school buses and crossing guards, and staggering school hours.	Remains valid. Emphasize viable options for students to get to school without driving or being driven —public transit improvements? Safe routes to school, etc.? Carry forward and update as needed.	
<b>Program C-13b</b>	<b>C-13b. TDM for Schools.</b> Require TDM programs for new or expanded private schools.	All schools, or is there a threshold? Presumably this is for Marin Academy, Dominican, etc. and not for day care centers.	
<b>Policy C-14</b>	<b>Transit Network</b> Encourage the continued development of a safe, efficient, and reliable regional and local transit network to provide convenient alternatives to driving.	Remains valid. Carry forward. Note link to reducing vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Program C-14a</b>	<b>Transit Network.</b> Support Countywide efforts to sustain and expand Marin County's transit network. Work with neighborhoods, employers, transit providers, transportation planning agencies and funding agencies to improve and expand regional transit to and from adjacent counties, increase local transit services, and provide responsive paratransit services.	Remains valid. Carry forward as stated. Cross reference the 2018-2027 Marin Transit Plan and the 2017-2026 Golden Gate Transit Plan in the narrative.	
<b>Policy C-15</b>	<b>Transit Needs</b> Support efforts to track, understand and respond to changing transit and paratransit needs in order to meet the requirements of specific population groups including, but not limited to, elders, youth, persons with disabilities, persons with limited economic means, residents of specific neighborhoods, employers and visitors to the region. Advocate for meaningful public participation in meetings and discussions with transit providers and ensure that the needs of those in the community who are transit-dependent are well represented.	Remains valid. Carry forward as stated.	
<b>Program C-15a</b>	<b>Transit Needs.</b> Work with transit providers to identify underserved neighborhoods and population groups and advocate for expanded service in those areas and populations.	Remains valid. Carry forward as stated.	
<b>Program C-15b</b>	<b>City Survey of Transit Needs.</b> In City-sponsored surveys of residents, seek transit satisfaction levels when appropriate and feasible.	Remains valid. Carry forward as stated. Also, encourage the transit providers to carry out user surveys and adjust services accordingly.	
<b>Program C-15c</b>	<b>Transit for Tourism.</b> Support efforts to provide and promote effective transit options for visitors to West Marin and other County tourist destinations, in order to reduce regional traffic flow through San Rafael.	Remains valid. Carry forward as stated.	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Policy C-16</b>	<p><b>Transit Information</b></p> <p>Encourage the development and dissemination of local and regional transit information to facilitate greater use of transit systems. This includes service, educational and promotional information. Support efforts to provide transit information in languages other than English as needed.</p>	<p>Remains valid. Carry forward as stated. Add use of technology (smart phone apps, real-time information on bus arrivals, etc.) as a way to improve efficiency and user experience.</p>	
<b>Program C-16a</b>	<p><i>Transit Information Dissemination. Encourage development and distribution of transit information through printed materials, kiosks, web sites, radio and television broadcasts, and other means. Provide transit information on the City's website, at City offices open to the public and through other dissemination means. Include transit access information on City meeting notices and in notices for City-permitted events, and encourage merchants to provide transit information in their advertisements and in their places of business.</i></p>	<p><i>Remains valid. Also, consult with Marin Transit and GGBHTD on other planned or potential improvements to encourage ridership, reduce transfer times, improve headways and service frequency, increase capacity, and be more responsive to transit user needs.</i></p>	
<b>Policy C-17</b>	<p><b>Regional Transit Options</b></p> <p>Encourage expansion of existing regional transit connecting Marin with adjacent counties, including basic service, express bus service, new commuter rail service, and ferry service.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regional Bus Service.</b> Encourage expansion of regional bus service to and from Sonoma, San Francisco, Contra Costa and Alameda Counties. Support efforts to increase the frequency of service, and expand express bus service along the 101 corridor to connect with major employers.</li> <li>• <b>Commuter Rail:</b> Encourage development and use of a viable commuter rail service through San Rafael operating on the Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit (SMART) right-of-way. Though SMART service will initially have its southern termination point Downtown, encourage efforts to ultimately connect it with ferry service to San Francisco.</li> </ul>	<p>Remains valid. Carry forward, with updated information on the status of SMART. Potentially add a new policy to better connect San Rafael residents, workers, and visitors to the SMART stations by creating more options for travel between trip origin/destination points and the stations, e.g., transit routes, shuttle services, Lyft/Uber, shared bicycles and e-scooters, etc.</p>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Ferry Service:</b> Support efforts to improve and expand ferry service, and provide efficient connections to the ferry via other transportation modes.</li> <li>• <b>Airporter Service:</b> Support continued regional dedicated bus and shuttle service to and from the San Francisco and Oakland International Airports.</li> <li>• <b>Other Regional Transit:</b> Support continued Greyhound Bus service and other similar services that may develop.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Program C-17a</b></p>	<p><b>C-17a. SMART.</b> Support the following design features for SMART commuter service within San Rafael:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establish stations in Downtown and in the Civic Center that will serve as multi-modal commuter transit hubs.</li> <li>2. Design stations and rail crossings safe for pedestrians and with minimal impacts on roadway traffic.</li> <li>3. Support crossings at-grade through Downtown and strongly advocate for trains that are of a length that they avoid blocking traffic at an intersection.</li> <li>4. Ensure that new development adjacent to the rail line is set back a safe distance and adequately attenuates noise.</li> <li>5. Encourage high-density transit-oriented development in the vicinity of the rail stations.</li> <li>6. Include noise mitigation as described in policy N-9 (Sonoma Marin Area Rail Transit).</li> <li>7. Provide a north/south bike/pedestrian path on or adjacent to the railroad right-of-way.</li> </ol>	<p>Delete this action, as it has largely been implemented. Some of the provisions (3, 4, 5, etc.) remain relevant and should be incorporated in a new action that reflects priority program elements for the next decade. This should include plans to address station pick-up drop off traffic, connectivity between train and buses, station area parking and access, impacts of train crossings on traffic, and long-term potential to elevate the tracks through Downtown. Also address transit center relocation and desire for a more welcoming experience for passengers arriving into Downtown San Rafael.</p>	
<p><b>Program C-17b</b></p>	<p><b>SMART Right-of-Way.</b> Maintain the SMART right-of-way for rail service.</p>	<p>Delete. SMART is now in operation and the ROW has been committed to that purpose.</p>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Program C-17c</b>	<b>Ferry Terminals.</b> Support creation of a ferry terminal at an environmentally appropriate location north of San Rafael, near Highway 37 and Petaluma River, offering service to San Francisco, in order to reduce regional commute traffic passing through Marin on Highway 101. In addition, support efforts to re-locate the Larkspur Landing Ferry Terminal to San Quentin in order to shorten the Ferry commute distance to San Francisco.	This action should be revisited based on current plans for ferry service expansion and input from the GGBHTD and MTC. Also, should address impacts of SMART extension to Larkspur on ferry service needs. Check regional ferry plans.	
<b>Policy C-18</b>	<b>Local Transit Options</b> Support improvement and expansion of local transit options including local bus, shuttle and taxi services. a) <b>Local Bus Service.</b> Support efforts to improve bus routing, frequency and stop amenities to meet local needs. b) <b>Local Shuttles.</b> Support efforts to create shuttle services as they become feasible to serve specialized populations and areas of San Rafael. If rail service is developed, support shuttle service connections between rail stations and major employers. c) <b>Other Local Transit.</b> Support Dial-A-Ride and taxi services serving San Rafael.	Remains relevant. Carry forward. Add policy regarding Transportation Network Companies (Uber, Lyft, etc.), car-sharing, and other modes.	
<b>Program C-18a</b>	<b>Improved Bus Stops.</b> Continue to support efforts to improve bus stops to provide a safe and convenient experience for riders. Allow commercial advertising to fund bus stop upgrades and maintenance.	Remains valid. Carry forward.	
<b>Program C-18b</b>	<b>Local Shuttle Program.</b> Should there be an increase in density in a potential service area or implementation of the SMART rail line, and if funding becomes available, investigate the feasibility of a local shuttle program to serve San Rafael.	Explore feasibility of a Downtown Circulator? Northgate / Civic Center Station Circulator?	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Policy C-19</b>	<p><b>Paratransit Options</b></p> <p>Encourage expansion of paratransit services as needed to serve specialized populations including seniors and persons with disabilities.</p>	Remains relevant. Carry forward.	
<b>Program C-19a</b>	<p><i>Paratransit Service. Support continued Whistlestop Wheels service, and support expanded regional paratransit services where needed.</i></p>	<i>Remains relevant. Carry forward.</i>	
<b>Policy C-20</b>	<p><b>Intermodal Transit Hubs</b></p> <p>Support efforts to develop intermodal transit hubs in Downtown and at the Civic Center to provide convenient and safe connections and support for bus, rail, shuttle, bicycle, and pedestrian users, as well as automobile drivers using transit services. Hubs should include secure bicycle parking and efficient drop-off and pick-up areas without adversely affecting surrounding traffic flow. Reference the Downtown Station Area Plan and the Civic Center Station Area Plan, which address and present recommendations for transportation and access improvements to transit within a half mile radius of the two SMART stations.</p>	Remains relevant—carry forward. Tie into transit center relocation and other activities to improve mode connections between SMART and buses. Weave in recommendations from the Downtown Station Area Plan and the Civic Center Station Area Plan as appropriate to address this issue.	
<b>Program C-20a</b>	<p><i>Transit Hubs. Work with Marin County, the Marin County Transit District, SMART Commission, the Golden Gate Bridge Transportation District, and other regional agencies to ensure that intermodal transit hubs are designed to be convenient and safe for San Rafael users. Work with SMART on the design of the new rail stations and the transit center interaction with the rail service.</i></p>	<i>Update this action to reflect status of transit center relocation and need for connectivity to buses and surrounding community at Civic Center station.</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>GOAL 14</b>	<b>SAFE AND EFFICIENT STREET SYSTEM</b> <i>It is the goal of San Rafael to have a safe and efficient street system that minimizes impacts on residential neighborhoods. Our local streets are safe and attractive, and our neighborhoods are protected from outside traffic impacts, such as commuter speeding, through our use of innovative traffic calming techniques.</i>	Still a valid goal. Focus of this goal is on improving safety and reducing the potential adverse effects of transportation and congestion on neighborhoods.  Only two policies and two programs—are there other safety issues or neighborhood compatibility issues that need to be addressed? Lighting? Signage?	
<b>Policy C-21</b>	<b>Residential Traffic Calming</b> Protect residential areas from the effects of traffic from outside the neighborhood by continuing to evaluate and construct neighborhood traffic calming solutions as appropriate such as speed humps, bulb outs, speed limits, stop signs and roundabouts. Ensure that traffic calming approaches do not conflict with emergency response.	Remains valid—carry forward. Final sentence (traffic calming should not impede emergency response) is especially relevant.	
<b>Program C-21a</b>	<b>Traffic Calming Program.</b> <i>Maintain a neighborhood traffic calming program under the direction of the City Traffic Engineer and seek funding for its implementation. Ensure neighborhood participation in the development and evaluation of potential traffic calming solutions.</i>	<i>Remains valid—retain. Add Safe Routes to School.</i>	
<b>Policy C-22</b>	<b>Attractive Roadway Design</b> Design roadway projects to be attractive and, where possible, to include trees, landscape buffer areas, public art, integration of public spaces and other visual enhancements. Emphasize tree planting and landscaping along all streets.	Remains valid—carry forward.	
<b>Program C-22a</b>	<b>Native Plants Along Roadways.</b> <i>Continue to regularly remove non-native invasive plants along roadways, and to encourage attractive native plantings.</i>	<i>There are a variety of non-native plants currently used. Potentially focus on drought-tolerant plants rather than native plants?</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>GOAL 15</b>	<b>CONNECTIONS BETWEEN NEIGHBORHOODS</b> It is the goal of San Rafael to have convenient connections between neighborhoods. <i>Our neighborhoods are conveniently and directly connected to one another and to activity centers. The daily life of our residents is enhanced because they are more easily able to reach workplaces, schools, shopping, and recreation areas by foot, bike or transit.</i>	Connectivity remains a valid goal and should be carried forward.	
<b>Policy C-23</b>	<b>Connections Between Neighborhoods and with Adjoining Communities</b> Identify opportunities to improve pedestrian, bicycle and transit connections between San Rafael neighborhoods and between San Rafael and adjacent communities.	Remains valid. Carry forward. Also address emergency response benefits.	
<b>Program C-23a</b>	<b>Better Signage.</b> <i>As opportunities arise, provide better signage, consistent with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan for bicycle, pedestrian and transit routes to identify pathways between neighborhoods and other communities.</i>	<i>Remains valid. Carry forward.</i>	
<b>Policy C-24</b>	<b>Connections Between Neighborhoods and Activity Centers</b> Seek opportunities to increase connectivity between San Rafael neighborhoods and activity centers.	<i>Remains valid. Carry forward. Also non-motorized connections between neighborhoods—e.g., paths between adjacent dead end streets, cul-de-sacs, etc.</i>	
<b>Program C-24a</b>	<b>North San Rafael Promenade.</b> <i>Support the creation of a promenade that connects the Terra Linda Shopping Center and Community Center to the Marin Civic Center as described in the North San Rafael Vision Promenade Conceptual Plan. Require sections to be built in conjunction with new development along the Promenade route. Work with community groups to seek funding for improvements in the public right-of-way, and for recreational facilities consistent with the Capital Improvements program.</i>	<i>Remains valid but should update based on current status. Address connections from SMART station to nearby destinations.</i>	



## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Program C-24b</b>	<b>Canal Crossing.</b> <i>Seek a pedestrian and bicycle crossing over the Canal to better link the Canal neighborhood with schools, shopping and other services.</i>	<i>Remains valid though not a programmed improvement. Can this be further advanced through the 2040 Plan?</i>	
<b>Program C-24c</b>	<b>Access between Downtown and Canal/Montecito Neighborhoods.</b> <i>Seek improved pedestrian and bicycle access from Downtown, under Highway 101, to the Montecito and Canal neighborhoods, particularly from the Transit Center to the Montecito Shopping Center and Grand Avenue.</i>	<i>Address as part of a broader program to improve connectivity between the Canal area and the rest of San Rafael, particularly for ped and bike traffic.</i>	
<b>Policy C-25</b>	<b>Meeting Local Circulation Needs Around Highway Interchanges</b> Work with appropriate agencies to address local circulation needs for all modes when freeway improvements are planned and constructed.	OK to carry forward as stated. Perhaps more broadly state that regional transportation projects should provide local benefits, address the safety of all travelers, and improve circulation between neighborhoods. This policy can provide a foundation for mitigation as Caltrans constructs future highway improvements.	
<b>Program C-25a</b>	<b>Highway Bus Stops.</b> <i>As interchange improvement projects along Highway 101 and Interstate 580 are in the planning and construction stages, work closely with appropriate agencies and the community to identify ways to improve drop-off parking at bus stops and bicycle and pedestrian access over or under 101 and 580.</i>	<i>Update this action to address other Caltrans projects, such as the 101 NB to 580 EB connector and Freitas Parkway interchange improvements.</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>GOAL 16</b>	<b>It is the goal of San Rafael to have safe, convenient and attractive bikeways and amenities.</b> <i>Bicycling has become an integral part of daily life for many San Rafael citizens. The city features an extensive bikeway system, nested within the larger countywide system, which connects riders with neighborhoods, activity centers, transit stops and surrounding communities. Bicycling is well supported by visible route signage, extensive bike parking, convenient transit connections, and public education programs promoting biking and bike safety.</i>	Strengthen this goal, consistent with the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan. An important point should be to make bicycling a more viable way of getting around the city and a safe, practical alternative to driving. The importance of cycling to the City's greenhouse gas reduction strategy, and overall health benefits should be acknowledged.	
<b>Policy C-26</b>	<b>Bicycle Plan Implementation</b> Make bicycling and walking an integral part of daily life in San Rafael by implementing the San Rafael's <i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</i> .	A more robust set of policies supporting bicycle improvements and education would be appropriate here, rather than this single policy. Even though there is an adopted Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, it should be more strongly represented in the General Plan than this.	
<b>Program C-26a</b>	<b>Implementation.</b> <i>Implement provisions of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan in conjunction with planned roadway improvements or through development or redevelopment of properties fronting on the proposed routes.</i>	<i>Remains valid. Carry forward.</i>	
<b>Program C-26b</b>	<b>Funding.</b> <i>Seek grant funding for implementation of segments of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.</i>	<i>Remains valid. Carry forward and supplement with additional actions from Bike and Ped Plan as appropriate.</i>	
<b>Program C-26c</b>	<b>Bicycle Parking.</b> <i>Update Zoning Ordinance requirements for bicycle parking.</i>	<i>Update based on current status and recommendations in the Bike and Ped Master Plan.</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>GOAL 17</b>	<p><b>PEDESTRIAN PATHS</b></p> <p><b>It is the goal of San Rafael to have safe, convenient and pleasurable pedestrian paths and amenities.</b></p> <p><i>Walking to reach local shopping, transit stops and other nearby destinations has become a part of daily life for many San Rafael residents and workers. Pedestrians are well served by an extensive network of convenient and well-maintained sidewalks and other pathways throughout the city. Walking is also a popular form of recreation, as users enjoy the Bay Trail and other urban trails through open spaces and neighborhoods.</i></p>	Can the bike and ped goal be merged into a single goal? Suggest restating this goal to focus less on “pleasurable pedestrian paths” and more on making it easier and safer to walk around the City.	
<b>Policy C-27</b>	<p><b>Pedestrian Plan Implementation</b></p> <p>Promote walking as the transportation mode of choice for short trips by implementing the pedestrian element of the City’s <i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</i>. In addition to policies and programs outlined in the <i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan</i>, provide support for the following programs:</p>	Similar comment to Policy C-26. May want to have a more robust set of pedestrian policies drawn from the Bike/Ped Master Plan rather than merely deferring to that document for direction. This would create a more balanced picture of the City’s transportation priorities. Policy itself is OK.	
<b>Program C-27a</b>	<p><b>Implementation.</b> Monitor progress in implementing the pedestrian-related goals and objectives of the <i>Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan</i> on an annual basis.</p>	<i>Remains valid—carry forward. Is an annual report prepared?</i>	
<b>Program C-27b</b>	<p><b>Prioritizing Pedestrian Improvements.</b> Develop a program for prioritizing the maintenance of existing pedestrian facilities based on pedestrian use and connectivity as well as maintenance need, and secure funding sources for its implementation.</p>	<i>Check against current program direction in the new Bike and Ped Master Plan and carry forward with appropriate amendments.</i>	
<b>Program C-27c</b>	<p><b>Bay Trail.</b> Support efforts and seek funding to complete the Bay Trail System.</p>	<i>Remains valid—carry forward.</i>	
<b>Program C-27d</b>	<p><b>Pedestrian Safety Enforcement.</b> Continue enforcement of traffic and parking laws that protect the pedestrian right of way on local streets (e.g., no parking on sidewalks or pathways, and crosswalk violations).</p>	<i>Remains valid—carry forward.</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Program C-27e</b>	<b>Pedestrian Safety.</b> Consider new projects and programs to increase pedestrian safety.	Check Ped/Bike Plan for additional safety measures that should be referenced here. Safe Routes to School?	
<b>Program C-27f</b>	<b>Disabled Access.</b> Continue efforts to improve access for those with disabilities by complying with Federal and State requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Seek to incorporate ADA improvements into street and sidewalk projects. Develop a program identifying street barriers to pedestrian access, and prioritize curb cut and ramp improvements.	Intent of program remains relevant, and an updated version of this action should be included. Check Ped/Bike Plan for current language on ADA compliance.	
<b>Policy C-28</b>	<b>Urban Trail Network</b> Encourage identification, renovation and maintenance of an urban trails network throughout San Rafael to encourage walking and appreciation of historical and new pathways.	Remains valid—carry forward. Check Bike/Ped Master Plan for additional policy guidance on urban trails and improvements to the overall pedestrian network.	
<b>Program C-28a</b>	<b>Urban Trail Network Project.</b> Prepare a plan to include a map and descriptions of existing and potential urban trails in San Rafael. Urban trails to be identified include, but are not limited to, historic neighborhood stairways and walkways, Downtown alleyways, park pathways, and creekside paths. The document should identify a network of connecting pathways that can be promoted for walking enjoyment, and means to preserve and maintain these paths.	Check against program direction in the Bike and Ped Master Plan to ensure that this program is supported and should be carried forward.	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>GOAL 18</b>	<b>ADEQUATE PARKING</b>  <i>It is the goal of San Rafael to provide parking that is adequate and accessible, with attention to good design. San Rafael uses innovative approaches to providing adequate parking. Our mix of accessible on and off-street parking is responsive to the unique needs of commercial areas, such as Downtown. In residential neighborhoods where there is a high demand for parking, the City works cooperatively to minimize impacts on residents and resolve conflicts between users. In some areas, preferential parking spaces are provided to carpool vehicles, low-impact electric vehicles, bicycles and other alternative modes of transportation to encourage their use.</i>	Goal remains relevant as stated, though should also address right-sizing parking over time in response to changes in technology, travel patterns, vehicle design, and car ownership trends.	
<b>Policy C-29</b>	<b>Better Use of Parking Resources</b> Improve use of existing parking and create new parking opportunities through innovative programs, public/private partnerships and cooperation, and land use policies.	A little vague as stated? Potentially tie to technology and efficiency.	
<b>Program C-29a</b> <i>(note there is no 29b)</i>	<b>Shared Parking.</b> <i>Promote shared off-street parking arrangements to serve private and public users. For example, consider shared parking in mixed-use developments or encourage private office parking lots to make spaces available for nighttime public use.</i>	<i>Remains valid. Carry forward as shown.</i>	
<b>Program C-29c</b>	<b>Innovative Off-Street Parking.</b> <i>Where feasible, allow off-street parking through stackable and automated parking systems.</i>	<i>Remains valid. Carry forward as shown. Other best practices also should be referenced (valet, automated space counters, etc.).</i>	
<b>Program C-29d</b>	<b>Parking Districts.</b> <i>Consider formation of new parking districts where warranted and feasible.</i>	<i>Add expansion of existing parking districts.</i>	
<b>Program C-29e</b>	<b>Parking Meters.</b> <i>Evaluate the feasibility of expanding parking metering in business areas throughout the City.</i>	<i>Still valid, carry forward. Progress since 2004?</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
<b>Policy C-30</b>	<b>Downtown Parking</b> Optimize the use of parking spaces Downtown.	Still valid, but may also want to address future development and parking facilities, and parking management strategies that respond to expected future demand, SMART, etc.	
<i>Program C-30a</i>	<b>Downtown Parking District.</b> Conduct periodic evaluations and, consistent with State Law, modify the Downtown parking regulations to meet changing needs and to optimize parking Downtown.	<i>Still valid. However, suggest replacing with a new action to implement the recommendations of the Downtown Parking and Wayfinding Study.</i>	
<b>Policy C-31</b>	<b>Residential Area Parking</b> Evaluate effective means to manage residential parking to minimize the impacts of excess demand.	This is more of a program than a policy. Replacement: Minimize the adverse effects of excess parking demand on residential neighborhoods through parking standards and parking management strategies.	
<b>Policy C-32</b>	<b>Parking for Alternative Modes of Transportation</b> Use preferential parking as an incentive to encourage alternative modes of transportation.	Remains valid. May want to clarify “alternative modes” is anything other than a gasoline powered single passenger car, eg carpool spaces, electric car spaces, etc.	
<i>Program C-32a</i>	<b>Preferential Parking.</b> Consider zoning amendments to encourage the use of preferential parking for alternative vehicles such as carpools, low-emission vehicles, and bicycles in parking-impacted business areas.	<i>This should be done on an ongoing basis in response to changes in demand and technology. Parking should also be designed so that it may be converted to other uses in the event it is not needed in the future.</i>	
<b>Policy C-33</b>	<b>Park and Ride Lots</b> Support regional efforts to fund and construct commuter parking along transit routes, near commuter bus pads, and possibly near inter-modal commuter hubs in order to support use of transit. Parking areas should include secure parking for carpools, bicycles and other alternative modes and minimize neighborhood impacts.	Remains valid. Carry forward. Add a policy on smart parking, technology, and monitoring the impacts of autonomous vehicles, TNCs, etc., on parking needs. Plan may need additional policies on curbside management.	
<i>Program C-33b (there is no 33a)</i>	<b>Commuter Parking.</b> Further evaluate provision of additional commuter parking near intermodal transit hubs in Downtown and in the Civic Center area to determine the effects of the additional parking on increasing transit ridership.	<i>Maybe simplify this to just say “Regularly evaluate the need for parking around the SMART stations and develop parking strategies that effectively meet demand.”</i>	

## CIRCULATION POLICY AUDIT

---

Reference	Statement	Staff Comments	Comments from Committee Members
-----------	-----------	----------------	---------------------------------

Potentially add policies on:

- Trucks and commercial goods movement
- Autonomous vehicles
- Smart cities / intelligent transportation systems
- Use of roundabouts and other design features that improve traffic flow
- Requirements for traffic studies/ when a traffic study is or is not required
- Operating efficiency of the network (signal timing, etc.)
- Addressing cut-through traffic
- Use of one-way streets
- Measures to mitigate increases in vehicle miles traveled
- Conditions for allowing reduced parking
- Formal complete streets policy (AB 1358)
- Special needs transportation needs (children, seniors, disabled, lower income)
- Car-sharing and bike-sharing
- Electronic scooters
- Rail crossing safety