

San Rafael General Plan 2040 Progress Report #3

PRESENTATION TO CITY COUNCIL

DECEMBER 2, 2019



OVERVIEW

- Steering Committee Membership Changes
- General Plan Progress
 - *Policy Development*
 - *Land Use Map and Alternatives*
 - *Downtown Precise Plan*
- Transportation Policy Issues

STEERING COMMITTEE CHANGES

- 24 members/ 22 alternates
- Attendance has exceeded 80% at every meeting to date
- Youth Rep Bromberg to be replaced by Eleanor Huang
- Youth Alternate remains unchanged
- Resolution included with Agenda materials

POLICY DEVELOPMENT

DRAFTS COMPLETED

- ✓ Land Use
- ✓ Open Space
- ✓ Conservation
- ✓ Air and Water Quality
- ✓ Sustainability
- ✓ Safety
- ✓ Noise
- ✓ Infrastructure

UNDERWAY

- Transportation
- Neighborhoods
- Community Design
- Parks and Recreation
- Economic Vitality
- Arts and Culture
- Justice, Equity, Diversity, Inclusion (JEDI)

NEIGHBORHOODS ELEMENT

- On-Line Tool Developed
- Meetings with Individual Neighborhood Groups and Coalitions
- Spanish-language Focus Groups through Canal Alliance
- Recommending follow-up plans for Canal and Northgate areas

LAND USE MAP AND ALTERNATIVES

- 2040 Draft Plan Map completed
- Adjustments to Land Use Map categories Included
- General Plan Map Amendment requests still being considered
- Three alternatives will be developed, each with different assumptions about job and housing growth
- Alternatives will be modeled for impacts on traffic, services, etc.

DOWNTOWN PRECISE PLAN

- Profile Report and Options Report
- Council Briefed on Downtown Options on October 7
- Staff is working with Opticos to address issues raised thusfar
 - *Economic feasibility/ parcel assembly challenges*
 - *Future of retail*
 - *Transportation improvements*
 - *Public space improvements*
- Outline of Form Based Code under review

TRANSPORTATION POLICY ISSUES

GENERAL PLAN 2040

Informational Report

CITY COUNCIL
DECEMBER 2, 2019



WHAT IS “VMT?”

- Measures the amount and distance of vehicle travel (origin and destination) attributed to a project or use.
 - *the greater the number of vehicle trips and the longer the distance of those trips; the greater the impact*
- Assesses the effects of a project on overall vehicle travel
- Favors higher density or mixed use projects close to transit



OVERVIEW

- **Must Adopt CEQA VMT Impact Evaluation Methodology prior to July 1, 2020, and apply in subsequent CEQA studies**
- **General Plan Update Policy Revisions on LOS**
- **Next steps**



CEQA VMT Methodology Decisions

- **Metrics**, or how VMT is presented
- **Screening**, or when to do a quantitative analysis
- **Methods**, or how VMT will be calculated
- **Thresholds**, or when a significant impact is triggered
- **Mitigation Options**, or how to address VMT impacts



CEQA VMT Project Type Applications

- **Land Use Projects**, development projects
- **Land Use Plans**, including General Plans, Specific Plans, etc.
- **Transportation Projects**, roadway, transit, bicycle or pedestrian projects



VMT – Climate Change Context

Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP, May 2019)

- CCAP targets 80% reduction in 1990 GHG emissions by 2050
- CCAP targets are in line with or more aggressive than State's targets
- Climate action and adaptation measures
 - **Low Carbon Transportation (38%)** - measures to increase use of ZEV/hybrid vehicles, **bike/walk, transit, carpooling**



VMT Screening, qualitative analysis

- **City may screen projects** that are presumed to have a less-than-significant VMT impact
- **Land Use Project Examples:**
 - Projects within ½ mile of major transit station or routes
 - Small projects (less than 110 trips per day)
 - Affordable housing near major transit stations
 - Local-serving retail less than 50,000 SF
 - Downtown San Rafael – projects in DPP study area



VMT Methods, quantitative analysis

- **For projects that are not subject to screening and require a quantitative VMT forecast**
- **TAM Marin County Travel Model**, for larger land use projects and all land use plans
- **Spreadsheet-Based Assessment**, for smaller land use projects



VMT Thresholds, impact trigger

- **Land Use Option A – Set threshold based on state goals**
 - OPR: VMT reduction of 15% below the regional (i.e., Bay Area) baseline (current at time of analysis) average
 - ARB: Same as above, but VMT reduction of 16.8%
- **Land Use Option B – Set threshold based on General Plan VMT performance**
 - VMT reduction on a citywide basis using new TAM model
- **Transportation Projects** – net increase in citywide VMT compared to no project scenario



VMT Mitigation Options

- **Trip Reduction Strategies**, increased use of transit, carpool, biking, and walking
- **Change in Land Use Project Mix or Density**
- **Citywide TDM Ordinance**, monitoring element would require new staff resources
- **Citywide Transportation Impact Fee Update**, add VMT reducing programs and projects



VMT - Next Steps

- **General Plan Alternatives Analysis (January/February)**
 - Includes assessment of Citywide VMT for 3 alternatives, VMT forecasts to inform VMT Threshold determination
- **VMT CEQA Recommendations to City Council (Early Spring)**



LOS OPTIONS

- Status Quo, Maintaining Level of Service
- Arterial Delay Index
- No Local Monitoring – Use VMT as the only metric

Status Quo, Maintain LOS

- Continue to use LOS in our current General Plan
- Requires greatest level of resources and time

3 Rte 454 & County Center Dr

NODE SETTINGS		TIMING SETTINGS															
Node #	3	Lanes and Sharing (#RL)	EBL	EBT	WBU	WBT	WBR	SBL	SBR	PED	HOLD						
Zone:		Traffic Volume (vph)	16	2220	0	3827	192	49	3								
X East (ft):	2081	Turn Type	Prot		Perm		pt+ov	Prot									
Y North (ft):	-390	Protected Phases	4	1		5	5	3									
Z Elevation (ft):	0	Permitted Phases				5											
Description		Permitted Flashing Yellow															
Control Type	Actd-Coord	Detector Phases	4	1	5	5	5	3									
Cycle Length (s):	140.0	Switch Phase	0	0	0	0	0	0									
Lock Timings:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Leading Detector (ft)	55	33	55	33	7	25									
Optimize Cycle Length:	Optimize	Trailing Detector (ft)	5	0	5	0	0	5									
Optimize Splits:	Optimize	Minimum Initial (s)	4.0	34.0	34.0	34.0		10.0									
Actuated Cycle(s):	140.0	Minimum Split (s)	11.4	41.4	41.4	41.4		16.6									
Natural Cycle(s):	150.0	Total Split (s)	15.0	110.0	95.0	95.0	125.0	30.0									
Max v/c Ratio:	1.04	Yellow Time (s)	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4		3.6									
Intersection Delay (s):	21.4	All-Red Time (s)	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0		3.0									
Intersection LOS:	C	Lost Time Adjust (s)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	0.0								
ICU:	0.94	Lagging Phase?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>											
ICU LOS:	F	Allow Lead/Lag Optimize?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											
Offset (s):	21.0	Recall Mode	None	C-Max	C-Max	C-Max		None									
Referenced to:	Begin of Yellow	Speed limit (mph)		55		55	55	30									
Reference Phase:	1+5 - EBT WBTU	Actuated Effct. Green (s)	6.0	116.0		110.0	131.0	10.0									
Master Intersection:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Actuated g/C Ratio	0.04	0.83		0.79	0.94	0.07									
Yield Point:	Single	Volume to Capacity Ratio	0.22	0.57		1.04	0.13	0.23									
Mandatory Stop On Yellow:	<input type="checkbox"/>	Control Delay (s)	53.1	9.6		28.6	0.1	60.5									

Phase Diagram:

- Phase 1 (R): 10 s
- Phase 2 (R): 95 s
- Phase 3: 30 s
- Phase 4: 15 s



Arterial Delay Index

- Develop a simple ratio between congested and uncongested travel time
 - Basically a simplified version of arterial level of service
- Include major arterials for each area of the City i.e for the Downtown area (Ex. Second and Third Streets)
- A project will be cleared locally if the expected travel times after the project is maintained.



VMT Only: No Local Monitoring

- Apply the CEQA VMT evaluation as described earlier
- No other analysis would be used to monitor local growth



Council Feedback Requested

- 1. Use a locally-based VMT Target (rather than 15% below regional average)**
- 2. Retain LOS as a Planning Tool**
 - a. Larger developments outside of Downtown would continue to be required to evaluate local congestion impacts.
 - b. A “delay index” would be used instead of intersection LOS
- 3. Retain trip-based mitigation fees**

