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
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