

Agenda

Civic Center Station Area Plan Advisory Committee
Wednesday, April 11, 2012; 6:30 – 9:00 p.m.
Volunteer Center, Guide Dogs for the Blind
350 Los Ranchitos Road



Desired Outcomes/Products

- Review responses to administrative version
- Give staff direction on changes to document

I. Welcome	6:30
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Agenda Review▪ Action on Meeting Notes▪ Announcements▪ Correspondence	
II. Open Time	6:45
This portion of the meeting is reserved for persons desiring to address the Committee on matters not on the agenda. Presentations are generally limited to TWO MINUTES.	
III. Administrative Version Review	7:00
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Introduction▪ Items with no consensus (each item will have the following process)<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Staff presentation○ Public comment○ Committee discussion and action▪ Discussion of other suggested changes<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Staff presentation○ Public comment○ Committee discussion and action▪ Other items raised by committee	
IV. Next Steps	8:30
<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Draft plan and implementation chapter▪ Homework – schedule outreach meetings▪ Public meeting structure	
V. Public Comment	8:45
VI. Meeting Evaluation	8:55
VII. Closing	9:00

Next Meeting: Wednesday, May 9
7:00 – 9:00 p.m.
For more information, call 485-3076



The meeting facilities are accessible to persons with disabilities. American Sign Language interpreters and assistive listening devices may be requested by calling (415) 485-3198 (TDD) or (415) 485-3067 (voice) at least 72 hours in advance. Copies of documents are available in accessible formats upon request. Public transportation is available through Golden Gate Transit, Line 45, 49 or 52. Paratransit is available by calling Whistlestop Wheels at (415) 454-0964. To allow individuals with environmental illness or multiple chemical sensitivity to attend the meeting/hearing, individuals are requested to refrain from wearing scented products.

Civic Center Station Area Plan Advisory Committee
Meeting Notes: Wednesday, March 14, 2012; 7:00 – 9:00 pm
Guide Dogs for the Blind, 350 Los Ranchitos Rd.

Attendance

Civic Center Station Area Plan Advisory Committee

Emily Dean	Casey Mazzone	Judy Schriebman*
Mike Fryer	Preston McCoy*	Jean Starkweather
Elissa Giambastiani	Rich McGrath	Tammy Taylor
Barbara Heller*	Andrew Patterson	Gayle Theard
Nicholas Kapas	Jeff Schoppert	

*Ex officio, non-voting member

**Ex officio alternate

Absent: Bob Huntsberry*, Brigitte Moran, Larry Paul, Roger Smith, Craig Thomas Yates

Observers: Greg Andrew, Maggi Garloff, Elaine Lyford-Nojima, Sue Mace, Kate Powers, Barry Taranto

Staff: Katie Korzun (Economic Development Coordinator, City of San Rafael), Rebecca Woodbury (Management Analyst, City of San Rafael), Paul Jensen (Community Development Director, City of San Rafael), John Eells (Consultant to TAM)

Welcome, Announcements and Introductions

Co-chair Mike Fryer opened the meeting at 7:02 p.m. noting a quorum present. He said the purpose of the meeting was to understand the contents of the Administrative Version document as well as the process for review.

Fryer asked for a motion to move the minutes. Nick Kapas noted that on page 3 of the minutes, his intention was not to imply that having parking available at the station is a negative aspect. He requested the second sentence be struck from the record. He requested that “too much” be replaced with “enough available” and that the word “some” be added before the word “people.”

Jeff Schoppert asked that “Marin Storage” be changed to “Public Storage” on page 2. Schoppert made a motion to approve the minutes with the changes noted. Jean Starkweather seconded and the minutes were approved.

Fryer welcomed back Gayle Theard to the group after missing some meetings due to illness. He noted that the April meeting would run longer than usual. Schoppert suggested an earlier start time of 6:30. Starkweather said the public might not know about the early start time and show up late. Elissa Giambastiani moved to start the April meeting at 6:30 and Tammy Taylor seconded the motion. All voted in favor, except Starkweather opposed. The motion passed.

Open Time

Fryer asked if any members of the public would like to speak on items not on the agenda. There were none.

Vision Re-visit

Katie Korzun said a subcommittee revisited the Vision Statement since the last meeting and made some changes, noted in the Agenda Packet. She said any further changes to the statement could be suggested at the next meeting during the Committee's review of the Administrative Version.

Rich McGrath thanked Fryer for his previous work on the original vision statement. Schoppert asked for clarification on the crossings mentioned in the statement. Starkweather noted that there are no views of the hills from the North San Pedro underpass of 101.

Kapas said the Vision Statement is a snapshot of where the group started and it should serve as a check to see if they are staying on track. He said it should be in line with the final draft and there may be reasons to change either one.

Public Comment:

- Greg Andrew said the reference to "steelhead salmon" should be changed to "steelhead trout." He also asked that the phrase "moms with strollers" be changed to "parents with strollers."

Plan Review Process

Rebecca Woodbury said the committee has been working on a vision, or a roadmap, for the area around a future rail station with the goal of setting a stage for a vibrant, mixed-use, livable area supported by a mix of transit choices. At this meeting the committee is seeing all their work compiled into one document.

The administrative version is a working document for the committee to review and shape into a draft for public review. At the next meeting, the committee will refine the recommendations and come up with a public review draft.

The public review draft will be presented to any interested neighborhood group or organization, the boards of the funding partners, the Design Review Board and the Planning Commission. Members of the public can comment on the draft plan through written comments by email or mail, at any of the public meetings, or at the June Committee meeting.

At the June meeting, the Committee will consider all the public comments received and then provide direction to staff on how to revise the Draft Plan into a Final Plan. The Committee will make a recommendation to the City Council that they accept the Final Plan.

Kapas asked about including access to Contempo Marin even though it is outside of the Planning Area. Staff replied that they would look into it with regards to the scope of the project.

McGrath asked about scheduling meetings with HOAs and other groups. Staff replied that the best time to set these meetings up is between the May and June committee meetings. Staff will assist with these presentations.

Public Comment:

- Greg Andrew said that stakeholder meetings should be held prior to the Design Review Board or Planning Commission meetings.

Presentation of Administrative Version

Chris Mitchell from Fehr & Peers and Barbara Maloney from BMS Design gave a presentation on the contents of the Administrative Version document.

Civic Center Station Area Plan Advisory Committee
Draft Notes for 03/14 Meeting

Questions of Clarification:

- Schriebman asked if the document contained mention of the “Green Streets” concept. The consultants said it did not, but does contain a section on Complete Streets. She asked if bike racks are covered. The consultants said SMART will provide some lockers for bikes in addition to regular racks.
- Theard asked if there is room on the Promenade for both bicycles and pedestrians. The consultants said there is a pinch point where it may be narrower, but mostly there is room for both. She asked about east-west access for Professional Center Parkway. The consultants said that access point is Merrydale Overcrossing.
- Giambastiani asked what the proposal was for the Public Storage site. The consultants said that if the site were to redevelop, it could accommodate a vehicular turn around/drop off area, and would be a good site for housing.
- Schoppert asked if the General Plan development capacity numbers in Table 3 were absolutes for each area, did they therefore dictate the type of development allowed, and if the land uses and densities proposed in the Station Plan was in conflict with those. Staff replied that the development numbers reflected the traffic capacity, and that different uses could use the capacity. For example, additional residential uses could go into the area east of 101, and would reduce the amount of office. It would be a situation of first in gets the capacity.
- Schriebman said the discussion on capacity was unclear.
- Starkweather asked if heights were mentioned. The consultant said they described buildings using stories and that generally, 1 story = 10 feet for residential.

Public Comment:

- Barry Taranto asked if the City was going to force out property owners using eminent domain. The consultant said a change of use would be at the discretion of the property owners. Taranto asked if the Plan recommends anything for the County property around the Christmas Tree lot. The consultant said the County has a Plan for their property already. Taranto asked if parking near Michael’s was considered for the station. The consultant said there is more parking opportunities located closer to the station. Taranto asked if the City has discussed housing opportunities with the owners of Northgate Mall. Staff replied that they have not.
- Greg Andrew said the North San Rafael Collaborative has submitted a letter to the committee and the recommendations were developed by consensus.
- Kate Powers asked what the MUP and crossings will look like. She also asked whether creeks would be incorporated into the plan and if there would be a discussion about flood mitigation.
- Greg Andrew asked about the funding responsibilities of the City and SMART for projects such as the Walter Place crossing. Staff said the Plan will have a multi-agency implementation chapter once the recommendations are finalized.

Homework

Woodbury said the committee’s homework this month is to complete a checklist on the Plan’s recommendations. The exercise is for voting members, but the public is also welcome to participate. The responses from the voting committee members will be compiled so at the next meeting you will be able to see where you agree and where you disagree with one another. Responses from the public and non-voting members will be provided to the committee for their information.

The homework is due no later than noon on Friday, March 30. The checklist can be submitted to Rebecca by email, mail, fax or drop it off. Instructions for this are on the cover sheet.

Public Comment

The meeting was opened to general comments by the public on items not on the agenda.

Civic Center Station Area Plan Advisory Committee
Draft Notes for 03/14 Meeting

- Barry Taranto encouraged the City to involve the County and the Northgate Mall with this process.

Meeting Evaluation

+	-
We made it!	

Closing

Fryer closed the meeting at 9:05 p.m.

Civic Center Station Area Plan Advisory Committee
 Draft Notes for 03/14 Meeting

Attendance

	2010			2011							2012								
	9/22	10/13	10/16	11/10	12/8	1/12	2/9	3/9	4/13	5/11	6/8	7/13	8/10	10/12	11/9	12/14	1/11	2/8	3/14
Damon Connolly* (CC)	E	√	(tour-optional)	√	(Brockbank)	(Brockbank)	√	√	(Brockbank)	-	√	√	√	√	-	-	Reappointed		
Emily Dean	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Michael Fryer	√	E		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	E	√	√	√
Elissa Giambastiani	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Barbara Heller* (CC)																	Appointed		√
Bob Huntsberry* (DRB)	-	√		-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	E	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nicholas Kapas	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Stanton Klose* (GGBPAC)	√	√		√	-	-	√	-	√	E	Resigned								
Greg Knell	√	√		-	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	-	E	-	-	E	-	Resigned	
Klif Knoles	-	√		-	-	Resigned		-											
Marcus Lee	E	-		√		√	E	√	E	E	√	-	√	√	E	-	-	Resigned	
Preston McCoy* (BPAC)	(Powers)	-		√	√	-	√	√	√	√	-	(Powers)	√	E	√	√	√	√	√
Casey Mazzoni						Appointed		√	-	√	√	E	-	√	√	√	E	√	√
Rich McGrath	√	√		√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Brigitte Moran	√	E		√	√	√	E	√	E	√	-	E	√	(Ann Hussman)	√	-	√	√	-
Larry Paul* (PC)	√	-		-	-	E	√	√	E	(Wise)	-	-	√	√	-	√	√	-	E
Andrew Patterson	√	√		√	√	√	√	E	√	√	√	√	√	E	√	√	√	-	√
Jeff Schoppert	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Judy Schriebman* (LGVSD)	√	E		√	-	-	√	√	√	√	√	√	(Loder)	√	√	√	√	√	√
Roger Smith	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	E	√	√	√	√	E
Jean Starkweather	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	E	√	√	E	√	√	√
Tammy Taylor	√	√	√	√	√	-	√	√	E	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
Gayle Theard	-	√		-	√	√	√	√	√	-	-	√	√	E	-	-	-	-	√
Craig Thomas Yates	√	-		E	√	-	√	-	√	-	-	-	√	√	√	-	√	-	E

*Ex officio, non-voting member
 E: excused
 BPAC: Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee

CC: City Council
 DRB: Design Review Board
 LGVSD: Las Gallinas Valley Sanitation District

PC: Planning Commission
 GGBPAC: Golden Gate Bicycle Pedestrian Committee

Civic Center Station Checklist Tally

This is the tally of the Committee’s positions on the recommendations in the Administrative Version of the Station Plan. Each recommendation is numbered for easier reference. A total of 12 Committee members responded. All comments are as stated by Committee members in their checklists. In the tally column, “yes+” indicates yes with a requested change and (?) indicates not sure. The tally as shown does not include any potential adjustments discussed below.

# of No Responses	Recommendations by Response	Total
0	2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 27, 28, 32	16
1	3, 4, 10, 12, 13, 14, 19, 21, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33	13
2+	1, 22, 24, 26	4

Staff and the consultant reviewed the Committee’s suggestions and responses with the intent of resolving as many of the issues raised as possible and to thereby allow no responses to become yeses. Our suggestions are shown in the last column. Where new text was developed, it is shown in *italics*. Some changes will take longer to complete and will be shown in the Draft Plan, if accepted by the Committee. Where no change was devised, an explanation was provided in plain text.

Assuming that the suggestions by staff and the consultant are accepted, the no positions in recommendations # 1, 4 and 12 would change to yes, and would change the tally as follows:

# of No responses Adjusted	Recommendations by Response Adjusted	Total
0	2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 23, 27, 28, 32	18
1	1, 3, 10, 13, 14, 19, 21, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33	12
2+	22, 24, 26	3

Where 2 or more no responses remain, it was assumed there was no consensus, and the item marked for Committee discussion.

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
Station Access and Connectivity (Chapter 3)				
1	Provide "Complete Streets" treatments throughout the Study Area, but particularly on Merrydale Road (both north and south of the tracks), Merrydale Overcrossing, and McInnis Parkway. (pp. 16-18)	2 no 1 yes+ 9 yes	<p>No. Civic Center Drive should be listed also as a priority for complete streets. (Elissa)</p> <p>No. Recommendations for Merrydale South of the Station are too vague to spur improvement to pedestrian flow in this area. In essence all that is recommended is widening the sidewalk along east side only. This is unacceptable. There is significant pedestrian traffic along the west side of the street. See my added recommendation at the end of this chapter. (ADDED: recommend the City consider acquiring from private property owners land covered by drainage easement along west side of Merrydale between Las Gallinas and Highway 101 offramp. This would allow more room for construction of sidewalks, bike facilities and formalized parking. p. 17; Merrydale south of Las Gallinas. The unpaved area on the west side of the street that is used as "informal parking" is a drainage easement. Half of this land is owned by private owners of the single family homes on the other side of the fence and half is owned by the city.) Also, the recommendation for curb extensions is somewhat unhelpful in areas where there is no sidewalk or curb, e.g. along the west side of Merrydale and at the cross streets into the residential neighborhood. Is there a more appropriate treatment that can be recommended? Could a section be shown of this "not quite complete street" that is being recommended? (Emily)</p> <p>Yes. It should be clear (and I think it is) that the complete goal is not always achieved. (Roger)</p> <p>Mostly yes. Merrydale Road should be "inviting" and "welcoming" to pedestrians and cyclists traveling through the neighborhood. Nick</p>	<p><i>Add a discussion of Civic Center Drive to Complete Streets in Section 3.1 similar to the discussion of Merrydale Road (North of the SMART Station).</i></p> <p>The Plan does not recommend acquisition of property on the west side of Merrydale Road. There have been Committee and public comments both for and against converting the existing parking to sidewalk. The Public Works Director has recommended against doing this, given the sensitivity of the adjacent neighborhood toward parking. <i>The reference to corner curb extensions will be revised to clarify that they are recommended only on the east side of the street, where sidewalks are currently provided.</i> Given the desire to retain parking on the west side of the street, the Plan recommends that improvements focus on the east side of the street, to get the best result there as possible. The Plan does not provide street cross-sections for Merrydale or other "complete streets" sections, where further study is required. There is not enough information to provide specific dimensions, and the changes are likely to be limited to one or two feet difference in lane and sidewalk width. A cross section where changes are this small, without accurate dimensions, will not provide useful information. Also, see Roger's comment on Complete Streets.</p> <p><i>Adjectives will be added to the text.</i></p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
2	Complete the Promenade from Las Gallinas Avenue to North San Pedro Road, including recommended modifications on Merrydale Road. (pp. 18-23)	0 no 2 yes+ 10 yes	<p>Yes with exceptions and additions. Signage posted for bikers stating all must obey rules under DMV & stop before crossing intersections & courtesy for all pedestrians. (Craig)</p> <p>Yes, but add language to final paragraph of p. 19 to make clear that any acquisition of private property will require owner/developer cooperation and consent to conform to the caveat in the "Northern Section" paragraph on p. 23 (Jeff)</p>	<p><i>Add in Section 3.1 Complete Streets that signage for all roadway users should be provided according to the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA-MUTCD).</i></p> <p><i>Add p. 23, Northern Section "There is currently no proposal to redevelop the Northgate III site, and extending the Promenade along this section would require the cooperation of the property owner / developer"</i></p>
3	Complete the sidewalk network, as shown in Figure 8 of the Plan. (pp. 25-27)	1 no 3 yes+ 9 yes	<p>No. 1. Legend is not clear: is solid blue line an existing sidewalk? If so, it should be removed from Las Gallinas, as there is no sidewalk on that street between Los Ranchitos and Merrydale.</p> <p>2. If report is recommending construction of a sidewalk, it should state impact of inclusion of new sidewalk on Las Gallinas. Will on-street parking be reduced or eliminated? Pedestrians, bikes, and cars all share the road fairly well currently, as vehicle speeds are low. Loss of street parking would be opposed by residents.</p> <p>3. Extend sidewalk along West side of Merrydale from Highway 101 onramp/offramp to Las Gallinas.</p> <p>4. Figure should show crosswalks, existing and proposed. Add crosswalks to Walter Place Crossing of Los Ranchitos; intersection of Merrydale and Las Gallinas (south of the station); and intersection of Merrydale and El Prado.</p> <p>5. Figure should show existing pedestrian facilities along Del Presidio connecting to</p>	<p><i>1. Yes, solid blue line is existing sidewalk, and dashed blue line is proposed sidewalk. Change legend in Figure 8 to "Existing Sidewalk" instead of "Sidewalk." Also change legend to "Proposed Sidewalk" instead of "Proposed Pedestrian Facility." Las Gallinas Avenue between Los Ranchitos and Merrydale does not have continuous sidewalks. We will research whether sidewalks can be installed in existing right-of-way without removing existing on-street parking or acquiring right-of-way. If so, the Plan will recommend sidewalks be installed along Las Gallinas. If space is not available, the Plan will remove recommendations for installation of sidewalks along this segment of roadway.</i></p> <p><i>2. See above.</i></p> <p><i>3. See response to earlier comment.</i></p> <p><i>4. Other than directly adjacent to the station, where pedestrian circulation is likely to be most substantially changed, showing existing and proposed crosswalks is more detailed than this Plan is intended to provide.</i></p> <p><i>5. Bus pads at Freitas and North San Pedro, and</i></p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
			<p>Freitas Bus Pad. (Emily)</p> <p>Yes with pedestrian walkway warning signal for crossing @ all intersections. (Craig)</p> <p>Mostly yes. I would like to see more improvements to sidewalk network than are shown in Figure 8. (Nick)</p> <p>Yes, but again be clear that the goal is mobility and safety, not sidewalks per se. (Roger)</p>	<p><i>pedestrian access to those pads, will be added to the figure.</i></p> <p><i>The Plan will include a note that appropriate signals, signage, and crosswalk treatments should be provided per the California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (CA-MUTCD).</i></p> <p>The improvements shown are those most recommended by the Committee and the public. However, as noted above, some additional pedestrian facilities have been added (although they are mostly more detail regarding existing facilities).</p> <p><i>A statement to this effect will be added.</i></p>
4	Maintain and Improve the Walter Place Crossing. (p. 25)	1 no 11 yes	No. While SMART may be improving the path crossing the railroad tracks and connection to the MUP, it is unlikely that SMART will also improve the path's connectivity with Los Ranchitos. The connection to Los Ranchitos is very deficient. The path should be widened to allow for bike and pedestrian use (similar to the promenade width); the pedestrian connectivity to the existing sidewalk along Los Ranchitos is OK, but the bike connectivity needs improvement. There should be a larger radius bend in the path and a ramps leading down to the northbound bike lane. Also, a bicycle crossing of Los Ranchitos should be included to allow bikes to cross to the southbound bike lane. As these improvements are outside the SMART R/W, they appropriate for inclusion in this plan. (Emily)	<i>The additional recommendations will be added to the Plan.</i>
5	Construct new pedestrian crossing at the west end of the Station, connecting Merrydale Road across the tracks. (p. 27)	0 no 3 yes+ 9 yes	<p>Yes. Absolute priority! Stronger language, endorsement please! Several examples on Caltrain. Any attempt to block access across tracks will result in vandalism. Allow ped and bicycle xing with proper safety& warning devices. This is a <u>must</u>. (Rich)</p> <p>Yes. SMART should pay for this. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes, however if financing will be a challenge to move forward with the SMART train project, then this can be deferred to a later date until a more robust budget is available. (Tammy)</p>	<p>Add Pg 27, paragraph 2: As part of the ultimate station design, <i>this Plan strongly endorses the construction of</i> a crossing on the west end of the Civic Center Station...</p> <p>Pg 27, paragraph 3: Additional study and work with SMART and the CPUC is required to make a final feasibility determination. <i>Once feasibility is determined, the City can pursue funding options in conjunction with SMART.</i></p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
6	Complete the Citywide Bicycle Network, as previously outlined in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and illustrated on Figure 10 of the Station Area Plan. (pp. 27-31)	0 no 3 yes+ 9 yes	<p>Yes, but no Class I, II or III without rules and regulations posted with bike fines, DMV & San Rafael rules. Fines ticketed by SRPD. Quality control. (Craig)</p> <p>Mostly yes. I would like to see more improvement to Citywide Bicycle network than illustrated in Figure 10. (Nick)</p> <p>Mostly. 1. Figure 10 Shows Walter Place as an existing Class I Multituse path. While it is separated from vehicular use, the narrow width and crumbling surface likely do not meet the Class I standard. Would be better to show as proposed Class I as improvements are needed along this short, but critical stretch. 2. Add section on bike parking at commercial centers in the project area. Bike racks (and lockers, as appropriate) should be encouraged at commercial areas to provide safe bike parking for those arriving to the area by train with their bicycle to solve the "last mile problem". Provide reference to section in other part of document if more detail is provided there. 3. Use only one classification in the heading and designations. E.g. "Class I Bikeways", not "Class I/II Bikeways." These are goals. It really waters down the goal when it is identified as two classes. Class 3 has virtually no improvements for bikes – this is not much of an interim solution for routes that we ID as having a goal of bike lanes (class 2). Although this double classification is explained in the text on page 29, the double classification appears elsewhere in the text (e.g. the recommendations) without the explanation. It would be better to include just final goal class recommended. (Emily)</p>	<p><i>See response to comments on item #2 above</i></p> <p>The improvements shown are those most recommended by the Committee and the public. <i>As noted in other comments, some additional bicycle facilities have been added.</i></p> <p>1. <i>Walter Place will be shown as "proposed" and the text will make clear that this crossing already exists, but will need to be improved to meet typical Class I standards.</i> 2. <i>Add a discussion of bike parking at commercial areas as per the City requirements and appropriate references to other sections.</i></p> <p>3. The double identification is somewhat confusing, but the intent was to be consistent with the City's Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which also identifies as multiple types. Changing the identifications would make this Plan inconsistent with the Bike and Ped Plan and is beyond this Plan's scope</p>
7	Implement shuttle service to major activity centers in the Study Area. (pp. 34-35)	0 no 5 yes+ 7 yes	<p>Yes. I believe that some employers, like Kaiser, will use their own shuttle service as they do now. Employers should be encouraged to do this. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes. Please mention need to coordinate GG bus schedule with train schedules. Specifically mention recommendation of shuttle/transit service to adjacent neighborhoods i.e. Santa Venetia. (Rich)</p>	<p>Add Pg 34, paragraph 5: Or, as an alternative, SMART may explore partnerships with local transit operators to provide new, expanded, or different types of service to its station. <i>Employers should also be encouraged to coordinate shuttle service to and from the station.</i></p> <p>Pg 34, paragraph 4: The combination of regularly scheduled fixed-route transit service and the two SMART shuttles will make for a mini transit "hub" at the Civic Center, where passengers can access transit service to multiple destinations</p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
			<p>Yes. If the shuttles won't be servicing commuters closer to Santa Venetia, will the bus transit system provide buses around the same commuter hours to allow those residents access to the train without having to drive to the station? This might help alleviate traffic conditions on N San Pedro Road, which is already congested in the mornings. (Tammy)</p> <p>Mostly yes. I would like to see more improvements to local transit (especially Marin Transit), bicycle and pedestrian options especially for areas in the Smith Ranch neighborhood. More transit options for late commute hours and weekends. More options for people who live in the Smith Ranch neighborhood. Funding to support last mile service for employers should be used in a way that complements local service for residents. (Nick)</p> <p>Yes, with Kaiser, COM, MT, MTC to all share costs of "free" shuttle rides and transfer from SMART. (Craig)</p>	<p>throughout the Study Area and beyond. <i>Shuttles and transit service should complement each other</i></p> <p>Add Pg 32, paragraph 1: ...connecting the station to key employment destinations in the Study Area. <i>Local transit service schedules should be coordinated with SMART train schedules to ensure convenient transfers. Shuttles and transit service should complement each other. Transit service should connect nearby neighborhoods to the station. Late commute and weekend trains should be met with connecting transit.</i></p>
8	Construct a transit hub with passenger amenities, such as benches, information kiosks, and helpful way-finding, to facilitate convenient transfers to buses and shuttles. (p. 34)	0 no 3 yes+ 9 yes	<p>Mostly. Should also encourage the use of "next bus" signage, to empower transit riders with real-time bus arrival information. (Emily)</p> <p>Yes, with up to date communication system for 511, 311 & GGT/MT. WSW signage notifying transfer point! (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. This should be implemented carefully and over time to insure it is actually useful. There should also be a funding mechanism for maintenance and upgrades as there are many examples of old, useless signs and directories. (Roger)</p>	<p>Response to all comments made in 4th paragraph p.34 and recommendation #8 p.40 <i>"In addition, the use of real time bus arrival technology is encouraged for all transit vehicles at mini hub to assist all travelers. A procedure for regular updates of information by all transit agencies should be established. "</i></p>
9	Construct vehicular turnaround areas at the ends of Merrydale Road north and south of the tracks. (p. 36)	0 no 2 yes+ 10 yes	<p>Yes. However, this should primarily be a site for housing. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes with high performance lighting & security cameras for SRPD, CHP, & Sherriff's dept. (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Absolutely. (Rich)</p>	<p>Change p 36 Instead it should be constructed if the existing mini storage lot were to redevelop. <i>It would require some space from the existing mini storage site, and would only be possible as part of a project redeveloping the site for other uses.</i></p>
10	Construct traffic improvements to support area growth, as previously identified in the General Plan 2020. (pp. 36-38)	1 no 1? 3 yes+ 6 yes	<p>No. Double lanes and other changes to Del Presidio and Freitas do not look safe. (Jean)</p> <p>Questionable. The Freitas Parkway/Del Presidio intersection is very dangerous.</p>	<p>Double turns are part of the existing General Plan 2020 needed improvements. As written, the Plan includes a statement that careful consideration must be given in the actual design of those</p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
			<p>Any changes should be considered carefully as stated. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes. Improve lighting for everyone! Posted signage for all Class I, II & III bikeways. DMV rules & SRDP posted fines for bikes. (Craig)</p> <p>Be prepared to modify those old plans and concepts to accommodate changes caused by SMART's existence and other changing community needs/patterns. (Roger)</p> <p>Yes. 1. Correction, 2.a.: Explore the feasibility of providing double turn lanes for northbound right turns from Del Presidio Boulevard to westbound eastbound Freitas Parkway, (Emily)</p> <p>Page 38: Since the report does not make an opinion on Roundabouts, delete the section. Delete "13" on "Summery of Recommended Changes." (Casey)</p>	<p>projects to the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p><i>See response to comments on item #2 above</i></p> <p>Add to top of p. 38 "SMART's operation in the future could result in changes to traffic patterns and volumes which in turn could require different roadway system improvements than those anticipated in the General Plan 2020. On going, regular monitoring of traffic will be done and the results reflected in General Plan updates."</p> <p>Correction noted gratefully.</p> <p>P. 38, paragraph 3 last line is mild suggestion for study of roundabout on Civic Center.</p>
Parking (Chapter 4)				
11	Consider implementing a neighborhood residential parking permit program. (p. 44)	0 no 1? 7 yes+ 4 yes	<p>Maybe. Consider only if it becomes an officially documented problem. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes. Only if necessary. (Roger)</p> <p>Yes, only if needed. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes. In consultation with the neighborhood. (Jean)</p> <p>Yes. Make sure the fees for residents are very low. I would prefer that hourly passes cost more to off-set the resident's fees for enforcing the parking restrictions. (Tammy)</p> <p>I am concerned with the cost will be to the city. (Casey)</p> <p>Yes. Parking permits one per household only! Must have off street parking & used at all times. Only one permit for street parking when proved vehicle owner owns said house or if houseguest rents of has lease agreement. More in depth detail is</p>	<p>Adjusted text p.44 5th paragraph "...the City has expressed willingness to consider such a program if it were desired requested by the affected neighborhood in response to a documented parking problem."</p> <p>Program is done on cost recovery basis and that sets residents costs.</p> <p>Program is done on cost recovery basis.</p> <p>Details would be addressed in developing the actual program.</p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
			<p>needed. SF is under development or their residential parking permits. (Craig)</p> <p>Yes, but add to Recommendations implement technology to monitor and communicate to potential station users needing parking real time availability of parking so as to reduce unneeded trips in neighborhoods and areas where parking is not available. (Jeff)</p>	<p>Added as item 2 e, pg. 48 <i>"Consider using new technology as it develops to communicate to station users needing parking the real time availability of parking"</i></p>
12	<p>To supplement the 130 parking spaces provided by SMART, consider additional supply at other locations in the area, as summarized on Figure 14 of the Plan, and coordinate with other jurisdictions to determine if other locations may also be suitable. (pp. 44-47)</p>	<p>1 no 5 yes+ 6 yes</p>	<p>No. I think the language about coordination should be more aggressive and should be broadened to encompass more than just parking. The County, SMART and the City should have an ongoing and proactive process for monitoring the station and making it more useful to citizens. (Roger)</p> <p>Yes. The vacant parcel northeast of the station would be more convenient for riders than the Avenue of the Flags. It should be part of SMART's initial parking plan. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes. I feel strongly that parking on Merrydale and other sites west of 101 Fwy be maximized to mitigate impact on Civic Center Drive and adjacent intersections. (Rich)</p> <p>Yes. Must be developed with quality spacing & must be according to ADA & Title 24 & DDAS. (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Xmas tree lot is THE logical location. Also the 30 space lot along Civic Center Drive and also the lots at the end of Merrydale (public storage and Marin Ventures) which could provide parking as well as residential; redwood trees and creek at back of these parcels should be preserved. (Jean)</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for <i>NOT</i> including the Christmas Tree Lot as a possible site for additional parking. (Tammy)</p>	<p><i>Issue of multi-jurisdictional coordination will be discussed in the beginning of the Implementation Section.</i></p> <p>SMART and the County both need Accessible parking and are looking at this lot. <i>Will address in Implementation Section.</i></p> <p>Parking is provided on both sides of the freeway and that on the west side will be easily accessible to the station by the multi use path.</p> <p>The City requires conformance to standards in the construction of new lots.</p> <p>See suggestions in sections 24 and 26 below.</p>
13	<p>Consider allowing reduced off-street parking requirements for new developments, if those developments can demonstrate that through incentives such as unbundling the cost of parking, use of shared parking, promoting carsharing, subsidizing transit passes, etc., they will not generate the need for as many spaces as would otherwise be required. (p. 45)</p>	<p>1 no 2 ? 3 yes+ 6 yes</p>	<p>No. I don't think exceptions should be made in the hopes that it will encourage a reduction in vehicles. If it doesn't reduce the number of vehicles, it would be a mess. (Mike)</p> <p>Unsure. "High density" housing equals "High Density" auto use and parking. Example is apartment complexes at N. San Pedro Road and La Brea Way where there appears to be 4 or 5 vehicles per unit, overwhelming parking areas along N. San Pedro Road, La Brea Way, Adrian Way, parts of Royal. I think people need cars</p>	

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
			<p>and not providing off street parking is asking for problems. (Rich)</p> <p>Not sure. Not sure if it would be effective or what the effect would be. (Nick)</p> <p>Yes. In concept this is great. In reality, we should be very conservative in its use. I would want very strongly stated caveats. (Roger)</p> <p>Yes. Only one parking permit issued to each household as proves in need. City and County incentives for no on street parking & greater pedestrian pathways. Tax breaks! (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Alternative parking should be available nearby. (Jean)</p>	<p>Add Pg 45, paragraph 5: ...based on strategies proposed with each new development. <i>Developments seeking to provide less parking than required by city code should demonstrate a parking program that involves periodic reporting to prove a true reduction in parking demand. Exceptions in reductions are subject to review by the Planning Commission as part of the project review process.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">and</p> <p>Add Pg 48, recommendation 4: If coupled with other strategies <i>that can demonstrably show a reduced demand for parking</i>, such as transit incentive programs, carsharing, shuttles, unbundling parking, and shared parking, new development may need less parking than the current ordinance requires. <i>Developments seeking to provide less parking may be subject to periodic review for efficiency.</i></p>
14	Provide adequate bike parking at the Station, as described and proposed in the SMART project's EIR. (p. 48)	1 no 2 yes+ 9 yes	<p>No. 1. It is not clear how many bikes "6 bike racks" will hold. If it is more than one bike per rack, that should be stated.</p> <p>2. Given the massive numbers of bikes parked at the downtown transit center, 14 secure bike parking spaces seem inadequate. While this plan cannot change what SMART plans for the station, it would be appropriate to note that in the event it is apparent the bike parking facilities are inadequate; this plan recommends adding bike parking adjacent to the station to meet demand.</p> <p>3. There was a long description of how much car parking is required for new development. Could this report include some specifics on what bike parking is required for new development?</p>	<p>Rack design has not been selected yet, but intent is at least 2 bikes per rack, with 1 in each of 8 lockers.</p> <p>Pg 48, paragraph 1: The City of San Rafael requires new development to provide bike parking, <i>but does not require a specific number of spaces.</i> ...The City and SMART should ensure adequate bike parking is provided at the station and throughout the area. <i>The demand for bike parking provided at the station should be monitored over time and additional space provided if needed.</i></p> <p>The City is evaluating bike parking standards in the Bike and Ped Plan implementation so no specifics are available.</p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
			<p>4. Per the City's Bicycle Master Plan, the City encourages the installation of bike racks at existing private businesses and institutions, and may be able to provide bicycle racks if those racks are publicly accessible. (Emily)</p> <p>Yes, but with rental fees set as \$1-2 all day. (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Including bike lockers. (Tammy)</p> <p>Yes. "Adequate" should not be interpreted as "over abundant". Supply should somewhat lag demand. (Roger)</p>	<p>Appendix B of Bike and Ped Plan states: For public-private partnerships, the City may work with private businesses and institutions to locate bicycle racks within the public right-of-way if those racks are publicly accessible. City does not provide racks.</p> <p>8 bike lockers are shown in SMART plans/EIR.</p> <p>See response above pg. 48 on monitoring.</p>
Land Use and Urban Design (Chapter 5)				
15	Protect existing residential neighborhoods. (p. 52)	0 no 4 ? 1 yes+ 7 yes	<p>Questionable. This is a good policy as long as it is not interpreted as being "no change at all." (Elissa)</p> <p>Is this interpreted to be "keep the same as they are forever?" Oh, never mind. (Roger)</p> <p>Maybe. They should not be able to dictate what others can use their property for. (Mike)</p> <p>I have a concern. In 5.7.3 "ALL Single-family areas" I want to protect the general character of existing residential neighborhoods while <u>relaxing restrictions on second residence units</u>. I would like to hear comments from full committee and public. (Nick)</p> <p>Yes. Top priority. (Rich)</p> <p>Yes. Especially from height of buildings out of scale of the neighborhood. (Jean)</p>	<p>The intent was to clearly indicate that the Station Plan did not include any changes in the existing single family areas. The second point under concepts indicates that there are changes for other areas.</p> <p>Changing second unit requirements is beyond the scope of the Station plan and is an item for the Housing Element.</p>
16	Encourage multi-family residential uses within walking distance of the station. (p. 52)	0 no 2 yes+ 10 yes	<p>Yes. Somewhere in the Land Use section there needs to be a statement that the over-riding need for housing in this area is for housing affordable to the workforce. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes. At least some should be required to be for lower incomes. (Jean)</p>	<p>Add to pg. 49 Land Use and Urban Design Section: <i>5.3 Affordable Housing</i></p> <p><i>The City of San Rafael has a long standing commitment to affordable housing, as reflected in</i></p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
				<p><i>policies included in General Plan 2020 which identify affordable housing as a vial community need. The City has developed policies and programs to produce affordable units by requiring new residential development to include affordable units and for new job producing commercial development to contribute financially to affordable housing programs. With the residential, retail and commercial development that could occur within close proximity to the Station, increases to the City's housing stock could occur. This Plan supports and includes those affordable housing provisions.</i></p> <p>Change recommendation 5.11.2 on Pg. 67 : Inclusion of additional multi-family residential development near the station will help increase ridership for the transit station. <i>Affordable units will be included in this new housing throughout the Station Area thru conformance with existing and future City Housing policies.</i></p>
17	Encourage increases in residential density and commercial intensity in the immediate vicinity of the station. (p. 52)	0 no 3 yes+ 9 yes	<p>Mostly Yes as long as traffic capacity is not exceeded. (Nick)</p> <p>Yes because City of San Rafael accordingly has rezoned all areas for higher density for affordable housing. (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. But density along with protecting the trees and creeks. (Jean)</p>	<p>Plan proposes adjusting densities within the existing General Plan capacities.</p> <p>Addressed in City policies and Recommendation 5.11.5 on Pg. 67.</p>
18	Allow limited retail in proximity to the station. (p. 52)	0 no 1 yes+ 11 yes	Yes, but stationary structures, no food vehicles etc. and all approved by residents of Terra Linda. (Craig)	Controlled by City ordinance
19	Implement design guidelines to ensure high quality design and compatibility with existing neighborhoods. (p. 61-3)	1 no 1 yes+ 10 yes	<p>No. What are called guidelines are in fact fairly strict rules enforced in an arbitrary manor. People should be able to do what they want with their private property. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes. TOD must be transit users only. No parking spaces. No resident in TOD own vehicles! (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Height of buildings compatible with the neighborhood is as important as design. (Jean)</p>	TOD encourages transit use. The Plan requires parking for TOD uses.

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
20	Restore and enhance the area's natural resources (e.g., creeks, wetlands, and hillsides). (p. 60)	0 no 1 ? 2 yes+ 9 yes	<p>Maybe. Enhance yes. Restore, no. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes. With community committee & Park & Recreation Commission's authority for development! (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Bike paths or parking areas or other needed facilities should not destroy wetlands or creeks. Not all the creeks have been identified. There is a lot of ground water and drainage water in the Los Ranchitos area, and there has been surprise flooding in winter. A study should be made of the creeks of the entire area before properties are rezoned. (Jean)</p> <p>Page 61, 5.9.1 – I suggest taking out the information regarding Sea Level Rise. Between, City of San Rafael's Climate Action and BCDC's Bay Plan Amendment, this issue is being addressed. With the current state and local policies, Sea Level Rise would be addressed in any proposed development. (Casey)</p>	<p>General Plan policies require review by Planning Commission and Design Review Board.</p> <p>Pedestrian and bicycle facilities are reviewed for conformance to General Plan Conservation Policies. Those policies are applied to as yet unmapped resources.</p>
East of US 101 Area Recommendations: (p. 55)				
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase office and retail FAR and residential density on the office/commercial properties. 	1 no 11 yes	No. I don't feel it is necessary or wise to increase the FAR for properties. There is room for growth without increasing the FAR. (Mike)	
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase building height and density to allow 5 stories of residential/mixed-use on the level lots near the station. 	4 no 2 yes+ 6 yes	<p>No. 5 story blogs too tall for this area. 4 stories max. Views <u>of</u> and <u>from</u> Frank Lloyd Wright Campus must be protected. (Rich)</p> <p>No. 5 stories seem like too much, especially east of 101. We are not trying to be the city center here. (Jean)</p> <p>No. I disagree with the second point in this recommendation; I don't think 5 stories are appropriate for the building height near the station. Perhaps 4 stories at a maximum. (Tammy)</p> <p>No. I feel 4 stories should be as high as it goes. (Mike)</p> <p>Insure protection of views and articulation of buildings. (Roger)</p> <p>Yes with community in existing housing approval! (Craig)</p>	Needs Committee discussion and decision.
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Planned Development (PD) zoning designations to allow residential uses. 	0 no 12 yes		

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Allow development of the Christmas Tree Lot at the same density as nearby lots, should the County seek to develop the site. 	<p>3 no 3 yes+ 6 yes</p>	<p>No. Pristine views of Mt. Tam would be eliminated forever by multi-story construction on Christmas tree lot. See #22 above. (Rich)</p> <p>No. I also strongly disagree with the fourth point, and I refuse to support that our plan include any ideas about how the Christmas Tree Lot should be developed. This property was never a part of the Civic Center Station area plan and it is not within our jurisdiction to make judgments on how it should be developed. It's entirely inappropriate to include it here and I maintain my position that it should be removed from this plan altogether. The rest of this recommendation is okay. (Tammy)</p> <p>I have a concern. I am concerned about credibility of SAP Committee process regarding recommending allowing development of Christmas Tree Lot at same density as nearby lots. It might be a good idea in many ways but process mistakes cast this particular recommendation in an unfavorable light. That in turn hurts the credibility of the entire committee, report and final recommendation. To truly represent the views of the committee, public and workshop participants, additional outreach and debate would be needed. It is kind of late for that. It is a shame; we should have handled this better. At this point it might be better to leave this to the County as we had originally discussed. (General recommendations regarding the overall area east of US 101 are more credible than a specific statement about the Christmas tree lot.) (Nick)</p> <p>Yes. This statement about the Christmas tree lot should definitely be included in the plan. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes, and with a project that enhances and/or takes advantage of its unique proximity to the train and highway. (Roger)</p> <p>Yes, but change verb in Christmas Tree Lot recommendation from "allow" to "encourage." (Jeff)</p> <p>Yes, but must be control development approved by surrounding residents not by County Board of Supervisors! (Craig)</p>	Needs Committee discussion and decision.

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement design guidelines that address preservation of views, buffers from the single-family neighborhoods, sensitivity to creeks and wetlands, and support for an attractive pedestrian environment. 	<p>1 no 1 ? 10 yes</p>	<p>No. What are called guidelines are in fact fairly strict rules enforced in an arbitrary manor. People should be able to do what they want with their private property. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes and No. I do not think that all views can be preserved nor that anyone has a right to "view preservation." This could become a very contentious recommendation. (Elissa)</p> <p>Yes, with no exceptions! (Craig)</p> <p>Yes! (Roger)</p>	
Redwood Highway Area Recommendations: (p. 57-8)				
26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase retail FAR and residential density on the properties near the station (Public Storage and Marin Ventures). 	<p>2 no 1 yes+ 9 yes</p>	<p>No. I don't think that retail FAR should be increased at Public Storage and Marin Ventures. They should remain as housing sites. (Elissa)</p> <p>No. I don't feel it is necessary or wise to increase the FAR for properties. There is room for growth without increasing the FAR. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes. Public storage and Marin Ventures properties are even more logical for some parking areas along with residential or mixed use. The redwoods and creek at the eastern side of the properties should be preserved as amenities for whatever is built here. (Jean)</p>	Needs Committee discussion and decision.
27	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase building height and density to allow 4 stories along Redwood Highway for residential development over ground floor retail. 	<p>0 no 1 yes+ 11 yes</p>	<p>Yes, but 5 stories ok! (Craig)</p>	
28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Planned Development (PD) zoning designations to allow a mix of residential and retail. 	<p>0 no 2 yes+ 10 yes</p>	<p>Yes. Design reviews by residents surrounding said development! (Craig)</p> <p>Mostly. p. 57 The freeway right-of-way and the rail corridor create significant barriers in this area, limiting movement by all modes of travel <u>automobile</u>, making easy access to amenities, services and recreation resources difficult. (Emily)</p>	<p>Design Review Board meetings are public.</p> <p>This section references existing conditions, and there are few existing opportunities for pedestrians or bicyclists to cross the freeway or rail line.</p>
29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement design guidelines, particularly for the properties along Merrydale Road, that include height transitions, building articulation, and varied setbacks to help buffer the existing residential neighborhood from new development. 	<p>1 no 1 yes+ 9 yes</p>	<p>No. What are called guidelines are in fact fairly strict rules enforced in an arbitrary manor. People should be able to do what they want with their private property. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes, but for sound quality, echoing, no residential windows to face East/101 nor commercial building windows facing 101 East. (Craig)</p> <p>Is this a repeat? (Roger)</p>	<p>Mitigations for sound buffering are developed for each individual project in their acoustic analysis. Each Land Use Section has specific guidelines</p>

ID	Administrative Version Recommendation	Tally	If not or if you aren't sure, why?	Suggestions and Responses
Northgate Area Recommendations: (p. 59)				
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase FAR and residential density on the properties near the station (Northgate Storage and Northgate III). 	1 no 1 yes+ 10 yes	<p>No. I don't feel it is necessary or wise to increase the FAR for properties. There is room for growth without increasing the FAR. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes but only if any new or modifications include affordable housing with 100% accessibility. (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Logical places for dense housing or mixed use. (Jean)</p>	This is beyond the limits of City policy.
31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase building height and density to allow 4 stories at Northgate III. 	1 no 11 yes	<p>No. Increase to 5. 5 would not affect views. (Rich)</p> <p>Yes. Logical places for dense housing or mixed use. (Jean)</p>	
32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase building height and density to allow 5 stories of residential or mixed-use development at Northgate Mall. 	0 no 1 yes+ 11 yes	<p>Yes, but only with 100% affordable housing with 100% accessible units! (Craig)</p> <p>Yes. Logical places for dense housing or mixed use. (Jean)</p> <p>Yes. I support the idea of putting mixed-use residential development at Northgate Mall, even at 5 stories. This is a more appropriate place for the increased building height than right next to the train station. (Tammy)</p>	This requirement is beyond the limits of City policy.
33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement design guidelines to buffer existing single-family residential neighborhoods from taller development, and address setbacks and ground-floor uses that will create an engaging pedestrian environment. 	1 no 1 yes+ 9 yes	<p>No. What are called guidelines are in fact fairly strict rules enforced in an arbitrary manner. People should be able to do what they want with their private property. (Mike)</p> <p>Yes. Design buffers with natural landscaping etc. No manmade buffers! (Craig)</p> <p>Again? (Roger)</p> <p>Absolute yes. Top priority. (Rich)</p>	Each Land Use Section has specific guidelines

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan

Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Ex officio Comments

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
Station Access and Connectivity (Chapter 3)		
<p>Provide "Complete Streets" treatments throughout the Study Area, but particularly on Merrydale Road (both north and south of the tracks), Merrydale Overcrossing, and McInnis Parkway. (pp. 16-18)</p>	<p>Partially</p>	<p>Complete streets is a good concept for multi-use transit planning but does not fully address other opportunities. Add in Green Streets component that was also discussed by committee. Complete streets are re: transportation; Green streets are re: water treatment, rain capture, stormwater runoff management and will be important when Phase 2 stormwater regulations go into effect.</p> <p>McInnis Parkway: McInnis goes nowhere—it's not a connector street; I don't believe the committee ever identified it as a prime candidate for complete streets. So why the Big Street Treatment? Better to have the MUP on the North side of the RR tracks where it can connect with Contempo Marin streets without an additional track crossing; that would reduce track crossings by 2 (one at the station and one at the end of McInnis, where a bridge over the water would have to be built. This will make it more useful and safer for bikers and pedestrians. Far better to increase the size of the marsh along McInnis by reducing the size of McInnis to allow for SLR and for the MUP on the north side of the tracks.</p> <p>Merrydale Road (south): with its creek alongside, is an incredible opportunity to beautify the walkway to the station and incorporate the creek between NorthGate Storage and Marin Ventures. This value of incorporating the creek is part of the Vision and has been mentioned many times by the committee; the consultants need to incorporate these suggestions as they were suggested. This should be bullet point 4: Incorporate creek areas as walkway amenities. Restore and enhance creek areas by widening and enhancing. Improve west side of Merrydale for walkers and bikers access rather than widening the sidewalk on the east side.</p> <p>If the city is truly wanting to encourage more biking and walking, it makes little sense for there to be a car-friendly drop offs on both sides of Merrydale as well as on the other side of the station. Peds and bikers should have ample room. Given that the road is narrow on the south side, where many local residents may walk to the station, I suggest traffic be routed one way around the station on current roads, with designated drop off lanes near the station, and</p>

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
	Yes	<p>keep the public access path for walkers and bikers only. This will allow a more leisurely pace around the station area on this side, which promotes shopping at local businesses especially cafes, restaurants, grocery and small retail. (Judy LGVSD)</p> <p>All improvements or treatments should take into consideration Gallinas Creek drainages, facilitate natural systems, give creek right-of-way, and use pervious paving materials esp along Mc Innis but also throughout the Station Area Plan. (Kate alternate BPAC)</p>
Complete the Promenade from Las Gallinas Avenue to North San Pedro Road, including recommended modifications on Merrydale Road. (pp. 18-23)	YES	<p>In addition, incorporate a stop sign for cars when exiting the parking lot before crossing the proposed Promenade path to give bikers/walkers the right of way. The current Promenade around the mall is hazardous, with bikers and peds having to dodge incoming traffic at multiple entrance crossings.</p> <p>SMART has to connect the MUP that intersects with Civic Center Drive; it is currently fractured and looks like a dead end. Extending the Promenade as suggested in the doc will increase connectivity and functionality. MUP alongside tracks should be placed North of the tracks, not along McInnis, to connect Contempo and reduce number of bike crossings the tracks. (Judy LGVSD)</p>
Complete the sidewalk network, as shown in Figure 8 of the Plan. (pp. 25-27)	Yes but	<p>I personally find sidewalks hard on the hips and knees and prefer asphalt paths for walking on. So I would prefer paths to sidewalks any day, recognizing that sidewalks are the preferred way in an urban setting. Do not see the need for sidewalks on both sides of a street if one side is good and you don't have to cross back and forth every block. So sidewalk yes on Los Ranchitos by the cemetery, where traffic is heavy; not so necessary on Los Ranchitos between Walter Place and Glenside. To preserve the rural nature of the area, clearly marked pathways would be more appreciated than a sidewalk on both sides. Not sure a sidewalk will increase safety when going under 101 at N. San Pedro and having to cross traffic exiting for the Civic Center. Sidewalk on the N. side is fairly cramped and very near fast moving and merging traffic. Some additional thought will have to go into making this area truly safe for walkers and bikers. It won't just be by making a sidewalk. (Judy LGVSD)</p>
Maintain and Improve the Walter Place Crossing. (p. 25)	YES	<p>And be sure to make it serviceable for the equestrians leaving Los Ranchitos and making their way to the riding ring at the Civic Center. This local color of horses and riders is highly valued</p>

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
		by residents; it builds community. (Judy LGVSD)
Construct new pedestrian crossing at the west end of the Station, connecting Merrydale Road across the tracks. (p. 27)	YES Yes	A crossing at this point is essential to maintaining the health of the creek and ensure good connectivity for the neighborhood(Judy LGVSD) Why not a bridge? Need to study the feasibility of a bridge that takes off and lands next to the vehicle turn arounds on Merrydale. (Preston BPAC)
Complete the Citywide Bicycle Network, as previously outlined in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan and illustrated on Figure 10 of the Station Area Plan. (pp. 27-31)	Yes but	While it might seem advantageous to use McInnis as a bike route because it already exists, having the MUP on the south side of the tracks cuts off residents of Contempo Marin from easily getting to the station by walking. Request SMART redesign the MUP to be alongside Gable Drive on the North side of the tracks, as it is when it exits the station. This would eliminate the need to build an expensive bridge over the marsh at the end of McInnis. Kayakers use this channel, so the bridge would have to be high enough to accommodate them. (Judy LGVSD)
Implement shuttle service to major activity centers in the Study Area. (pp. 34-35)		
Construct a transit hub with passenger amenities, such as benches, information kiosks, and helpful way-finding, to facilitate convenient transfers to buses and shuttles. (p. 34)		
Construct vehicular turnaround areas at the ends of Merrydale Road north and south of the tracks. (p. 36)	NO	Very ok with Northern turnaround. Do not want to see the southern turnaround extended onto the access road. This makes the area unpleasant for walkers and bikers and limits the amount of public space available for enjoying the creek. We have 3 other close to cars drop off points. Suggest that cars be routed onto the streets that currently exist, with a dedicated one way drop-off lane created by connecting Merrydale (before crossing the creek on the current bridge) through the Marin Ventures parking lot to Redwood Highway. (Judy LGVSD)
Construct traffic improvements	This section has	General plans for circulation improvements were not in this committee's purview. If this is to

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
to support area growth, as previously identified in the General Plan 2020. (pp. 36-38)	serious flaws	be included in this document, it should be made clear what is being proposed. Section 3.6.3 items 1, 2a, 2b, 2c and 3 are not clear. Needs map/drawing showing changes proposed. Or remove this section from doc. Roundabout objections are based on 4-way traffic, which is not the case with the areas where roundabouts were being proposed (mainly for the ends of Merrydale). However, the turnaround design does what a good roundabout would do; keep traffic moving smoothly. (Judy LGVSD)
Parking (Chapter 4)		
Consider implementing a neighborhood residential parking permit program. (p. 44)	YES	(Judy LGVSD)
To supplement the 130 parking spaces provided by SMART, consider additional supply at other locations in the area, as summarized on Figure 14 of the Plan, and coordinate with other jurisdictions to determine if other locations may also be suitable. (pp. 44-47)	YES, but	If configuration of McInnis is changed to increase marshland/levee structure to accommodate projected SLR, these spaces would not be available. Highest best use may not be for parking or bike lane. (Judy LGVSD)
Consider allowing reduced off-street parking requirements for new developments, if those developments can demonstrate that through incentives such as unbundling the cost of parking, use of shared parking, promoting carsharing, subsidizing transit passes, etc.,	Yes, but	This will need constant monitoring and enforcement by SR to be practical. People will take advantage of lower rents and park their cars on the street instead. It's a good idea but how will this be managed in reality? Will additional retail (groceries, sundries, school supplies) be located nearby to allow people to live without cars if they have families with small children? (Judy LGVSD)

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
they will not generate the need for as many spaces as would otherwise be required. (p. 45)		
Provide adequate bike parking at the Station, as described and proposed in the SMART project's EIR. (p. 48)		How many bike per rack? Bike rack parking for 6 bikes is not enough. Suggest 14-20 bike spaces that do not require dealing w/ authorities like bike lockers do. Suggest adding "Preliminary requirements are for bike racks that are located in a high visibility area that will provide parking for 14 to 20 bikes. This is in addition to the 8 bike lockers mentioned above. Designate space to add additional bike parking in the future when needed. (Preston BPAC)
Land Use and Urban Design (Chapter 5)		
Protect existing residential neighborhoods. (p. 52)		
Encourage multi-family residential uses within walking distance of the station. (p. 52)	Yes but	There are known health effects for living near a freeway, including increased rates of autism, asthma, heart attack, arthritis, emphysema, etc. We need to NOT locate our workforce so close to the freeway that their health suffers. Affordable should not mean unsafe for one's health, especially those with children. (Judy LGVSD)
Encourage increases in residential density and commercial intensity in the immediate vicinity of the station. (p. 52)	Yes but	Commercial/office/retail should front the freeway to provide a buffer to housing that should be located further away to protect residents' health. (Judy LGVSD)
Allow limited retail in proximity to the station. (p. 52)	YES	Especially neighborhood serving retail. Increased housing densities will support this usage. Imagine yourself as a working mom or dad with kids; what do you regularly need close by? (Judy LGVSD)
Implement design guidelines to ensure high quality design and compatibility with existing neighborhoods. (p. 61-3)	YES and	Where people are tightly packed in high density housing, access to parks becomes a priority. Any future development needs to take people's need for outdoor open space into account. We are fortunate that the Civic Center grounds are so close by but additional opportunities for developing parks should be strongly encouraged. Integration and enhancement of the creeks and adjacent wetlands should be an integral part of such high quality design. Kids need safe places to play. (Judy LGVSD)

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amend Planned Development (PD) zoning designations to allow residential uses. • Allow development of the Christmas Tree Lot at the same density as nearby lots, should the County seek to develop the site. • Implement design guidelines that address preservation of views, buffers from the single-family neighborhoods, sensitivity to creeks and wetlands, and support for an attractive pedestrian environment. 	<p>Not sure</p> <p>Not sure</p>	<p>Sea level rise could make this unfeasible (Preston BPAC)</p> <p>Sea level rise could make this unfeasible (Preston BPAC)</p>
<p>Redwood Highway Area Recommendations: (p. 57-8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase retail FAR and residential density on the properties near the station (Public Storage and Marin Ventures). • Increase building height and density to allow 4 stories along Redwood Highway for residential development over ground floor retail. • Amend Planned Development 	<p>Not completely</p>	<p>There is a creek that flows alongside Redwood Highway. There are springs upstream that feed this wetland area year round, as cattails are doing very well there. The major creek flowing along the tracks to the station is not mentioned. Schooling fish are found upstream; this drains from the Golden Hinde area. The creek that exits along Merrydale is no remnant; it is culverted through the Meadows area but flows free from the Los Ranchitos area upstream and connects downstream via a channel that goes directly to the bay. Herons are seen hunting along Merrydale's creek. These creeks should be described better in the Existing Conditions section. This is where the consultants should recommend specific restoration opportunities.</p> <p>If we could wave a magic wand, I would create a walkway/bikeway path along the Redwood Highway creek, plant more trees, remove one lane of the street to do so and create a natural buffer between 101 and the businesses and people that live along Merrydale. I would also stack commercial/retail/office against the freeway as a noise and exhaust buffer for residents</p>

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
<p>(PD) zoning designations to allow a mix of residential and retail.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implement design guidelines, particularly for the properties along Merrydale Road, that include height transitions, building articulation, and varied setbacks to help buffer the existing residential neighborhood from new development. 		<p>located further away.</p> <p>I have heard conflicting accounts of mixed retail and residential; complaints of delivery noise, etc; In most parts of the world, living above retail is common practice. These usages need to be sensitively considered to create harmonious living and working conditions. Quality building (soundproofing, etc) must be required.</p> <p>Four stories may block views of the hills or create shadows on existing areas. Design guidelines will need to take these factors into account. Health issues of locating affordable housing so near a freeway needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Otherwise the recommendations are ok. (Judy LGVSD)</p>
<p>Northgate Area Recommendations: (p. 59)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase FAR and residential density on the properties near the station (Northgate Storage and Northgate III). Increase building height and density to allow 4 stories at Northgate III. Increase building height and density to allow 5 stories of residential or mixed-use development at Northgate Mall. Implement design 	Yes but	<p>Do not agree with increasing FAR above 44 units/acre. The committee was never given this choice to discuss; in fact we were not given Northgate to discuss at all! While this site is perfect for high density and affordable and workforce housing, the densities described have not been appropriately vetted.</p> <p>Concerns regarding locating housing so near the freeway at the Northgate III site. The health and safety of people located in such residences needs to be addressed, as has been previously mentioned. (Judy LGVSD)</p>

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

Recommendation	Do you agree with this recommendation?	If not or if you aren't sure, why?
<p>guidelines to buffer existing single-family residential neighborhoods from taller development, and address setbacks and ground-floor uses that will create an engaging pedestrian environment.</p>		

Judy I have the following additional comments that were outside the parameters of this table:

1. Page 8-10: Need to add in SR's Climate Change Action Plan as an important doc that should have been consulted in the formulation of this draft. It certainly should be mentioned. A lot of work went into the CCAP and its suggestions should be incorporated here. Many of the design plans in this doc fit in well with the CCAP.
2. Page 13: 1.5.1: Public Involvement: Some members of the public were more equal than others. Eg when the community was commenting on the Alternatives at the second community workshop and 2 members of the public preferred "NO Change" and their comments were not included in the summary while the one business owner, who wanted substantial change, had his comment included. Also, a member of the public was denied time to speak on the traffic issue. When committee members had to drop out, they were also not replaced, resulting in a lack of representation for their area of expertise/community. This section sounds very inclusive and nice but doesn't reflect reality. This was not a true public process. People were appointed to serve on this committee; it was not truly open for all the public to be a part of at the committee level. It would be better for this doc to reflect reality, that much of the assumptions were driven by MTCC's grant proposal, ABAG's growth numbers and City of San Rafael's own agenda. This should be included in the text. It will make the doc stronger if it reflects the additional political realities driving this process.
3. The riding ring at the Civic Center was built by the horse riding community and now serves many additional users, including county fair. It is important that horses and riders from the Los Ranchitos area have a safe route to there after the train comes in. They currently use the pathway alongside the train tracks. This needs to be maintained for their usage.
4. Design Guidelines pp 62-66; additions: Incorporate easy access to parks/outdoor play space in high density developments. Quality materials to reduce noise and pollution impacts from the freeway must be incorporated in all residential developments (or medical costs to the community will soar.) Green street designs for water treatment via swales for parking lot runoff and water capture via cisterns and rainbarrels where appropriate. Solar or green roofs to reduce climate change impacts. Incorporate the already existing creeks, marshes and wetlands as amenities by restoration and

San Rafael Civic Center Station Area Plan Checklist for Review of Administrative Version

enhancement and sensitive design. Provide suitably covered trash cans with regular pick up to prevent trash washing into the streets and waterways. Lighting near sensitive creek and wetland areas should be such that people can see without the natural area being blindingly lit. Low (knee high) path lighting may be preferable to large overhead structures in some locations.

**DISTRICT BOARD**

Megan Clark
Russ Greenfield
Larry Loder
Craig K. Murray
Judy Schriebman

DISTRICT ADMINISTRATION

Mark R. Williams,
General Manager
Michael Cortez,
District Engineer
Janice Mandler,
Collection System/Safety Manager
Susan McGuire,
Administrative Services Manager
Mark Von Aspern,
Plant Manager

March 13, 2012

Rebecca Woodbury, Project Coordinator
City of San Rafael
1400 Fifth Ave.
San Rafael, CA 94901

RE: SMART Civic Center Design Area

Dear SMART Civic Center Design Area Committee:

The Las Gallinas Valley Sanitary District requests that the impacts of sea level rise on current and future sewer system infrastructure be considered by SMART planning agencies. Bay and coastal sanitary sewer agencies are paying close attention to the data on climate change and sea level rise. Many agencies will struggle to maintain their existing treatment plants and sewer system infrastructure because of sea level rise. Careful planning must be implemented to avoid significant costs due to poor sea level rise planning. For example, much of our new recycled water plant can be easily disassembled and relocated to a new location in the event of significant sea level rise. In some cases, a plan of abandonment should be considered in areas where it is cost prohibitive to protect flooded areas.

The 2009 BCDC map shows 16 inches of rise by 2050 and 55 inches by 2100:
http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/planning/climate_change/maps/16_55/cbay_north.pdf. Along McInnis Parkway, the high tide mark is a mere three feet below the roadway and will be covered with water if the BCDC map predictions are realized.

LGVSD is already severely impacted by Santa Venetia's leaking levees and insufficient and deteriorating storm water infrastructure. The majority of our Santa Venetia gravity sewer main pipes were replaced in the 1980's to reduce the amount of salt water intrusion impacting our water quality and reclamation facilities. Despite spending millions of dollars to do this, salt water intrusion continues to deteriorate recycled water quality. This has an impact on our ability to produce recycled water for Marin. Recycled water is a significant buffer against the effects of climate change as it protects our potable water supplies.

The Marin Lagoon development homes are just above sea level and require nine District sewage pump stations to convey sewage to our Civic Center sewage pump station. There only 224 homes in the Marin Lagoon development. These nine pump station represent 1/3 of our total number of the District's sewage pump stations. The Marin Lagoon development required an excessive

amount of pump stations because it was constructed on bay mud. Marin Lagoon homeowners are experiencing uneven settle which will worsen with time.

Another issue with building infrastructure behind levees is that levees act not only to keep sea water out, but also act like a holding tank keeping flood waters in. The picture below shows Santa Venetia in the flood of 1983. The four pump stations that serve the neighborhood could not keep up with the deluge of stormwater. During this event, the District sewer system was severely impacted. Climate change scientists predict more severe storms like this one in the next century. Stormwater entering our sewer system during the December/January 2005/2006 storm event increased our flow from an average of 2.3 million gallons per day to levels as high as 15.1 million gallons.



High floodwaters also create a dangerous situation for District and other emergency workers, who must put themselves in harm's way to protect public health and safety. It is not easy nor is it safe to work against the pressure of flooding waters.

As the water evaporates and the natural cycle of sediment deposition is stopped, land behind the levees subsides over time. This is obvious in the diked lands near our plant, where the marsh on one side of the levee is about four feet from the top of the levee and on the landward side is nearly fifteen feet below. The photos below were taken from the same location atop the levee road.



Sewer system pipes and manholes crack and break when the land subsides irregularly. These cracks and breaks also allow stormwater and mud/debris to enter our sewer system. Water following the path of aging and leaking stormwater pipes wash away bay mud near homes, yards and roads causing severe settlement issues. The pictures below are representative of uneven settlement throughout Santa Venetia.



It can be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to maintain infrastructure below sea level. Governments around the world, including the US and State of California, have been recommending a plan of managed retreat for areas that cannot be saved from rising water levels. Part of this managed retreat strategy is to avoid putting more infrastructure in coastal, bay, river or delta floodplains, as this is an expensive and difficult battle to win as indicated in the following article:

http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/initiatives/shoreline_ppr_retreat.html

Managed Retreat Strategies

Overview:

Managed or planned retreat allows the shoreline to advance inward unimpeded. As the shore erodes, buildings and other infrastructure are either **demolished or relocated inland**. Coastal managers realize that in many situations attempting to stop erosion through structural or non-structural solutions is a losing battle. **Shoreline protection efforts and/or their repeated maintenance would be too costly and ultimately ineffective** at preventing further erosion. A managed retreat approach typically involves establishing thresholds to trigger demolition or relocation of structures threatened by erosion. Therefore, this approach is frequently coupled with several other planning and regulatory techniques including: shoreline planning, to identify high-risk areas where this type of policy would be the only cost-effective, long-term solution; regulating the type of structure allowed near the shore to ensure that buildings are small enough and constructed in a way to facilitate relocation when needed; and instituting relocation assistance and/or buy-back programs to help with relocation costs or compensate property owners when their property becomes unusable. While the overall policy emphasizes retreat, a managed retreat approach may allow some erosion control measures using soft-stabilization techniques to prolong the life of shorefront buildings and other infrastructure for a little while. However, hard stabilization structures or repeated beach renourishment are generally not permitted.

Benefits: Usually less expensive than costly structural stabilization projects that may only be a temporary solution, especially in highly erosive areas. Maintains natural shoreline dynamics and enables shoreline habitats to migrate inland as the shoreline erodes to prevent loss of wetlands and other intertidal areas.

Drawbacks: Can be politically difficult to implement, especially where significant development has already occurred. May cause depreciation of shorefront property values.

Case Studies:

Pacifica State Beach Adopts Managed Retreat Strategy

Multi-pronged Approach to Manage Erosion at Surfer's Point, Ventura, CA

In closing, we ask that you consider sea level rise and the potential impacts on our District and our ratepayers in planning your current and future projects. I can be reached at 415-472-1734.

Sincerely,



Mark R. Williams
General Manager

cc LGVSD Board