

**Summary of San Rafael General Plan 2040 Steering Committee Meeting
Meeting #21 January 8, 2020
6:00 – 9:00 PM at 750 Lindero St.**

Attendance

Members Present: *DJ Allison, Maribeth Bushey, Bill Carney, Omar Carrera, Berenice Davidson, Richard Hall, Eleanor Huang, Linda Jackson, Margaret Johnston, Jeff Jones, Bonnie Marmor, Robert Miller, Stephanie Plante, Kate Powers, Jeff Rhoads, Jackie Schmidt, Roger Smith, Sparkie Spaeth, Karen Strolia, Cecilia Zamora*

Alternates Seated: *Jed Greene*

Members Excused: *Don Blayney, Jenny Broering, Eric Holm, Drew Norton*

Staff Present: *Susan Andrade Wax, Raffi Boloyan, Allison Giffin, Barry Miller, Rafat Raie*

Consultants: *Bob Grandy (Fehr and Peers)*

Sign-Ins: *Shirl Buss, Shirley Fischer, Cathy Manovi, Laurie Parini, Pam Reaves*

(1/2) CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 PM.

(3) APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 13, 2019 were approved without amendment (Motion: Rhoads, second: Jones). Committee members who were not present at that meeting abstained from the vote.

Chair Plante welcomed Eleanor Huang, the new Youth representative to the Steering Committee. Eleanor is a student at the Marin School of Environmental Leadership/ Terra Linda High School. She introduced herself to the Committee.

(4) PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments on items not on the agenda. Project Manager (PM) Miller reviewed the agenda and noted that paper copies had been provided. A letter on Items 5 B/C had been submitted and was distributed to each Committee member.

(5) PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Parks and Recreation Policies – Presentation and Discussion:

Project Manager (PM) Miller introduced Library and Recreation Director Susan Andrade Wax. He then walked the Committee through the Draft Parks and Recreation policies. Miller noted that the Draft Element was shorter than General Plan 2020, as it omitted the detailed recommendations for each park. He explained that these details will be covered by a Parks Master Plan that will be done after the General Plan is adopted. He asked that comments on the policies be provided by January 31.

The following comments were made by Committee members (*staff responses are in italics font*):

- The 2020 Plan also suggested we do a Parks Master Plan, but it never got done. How do we know we will get one after this Plan is adopted? *PM Miller noted that this was expressed as the top priority of this Element.*
- Does the absence of a Parks Master Plan mean we don't know our facility needs and conditions? *Director Andrade-Wax responded the City has done a facilities assessment—but a Parks Master Plan is something different. It also includes a needs assessment and covers maintenance, operational, and programming issues. It is based on focus groups, surveys, demographic analysis, etc. It is not just a wish list.*
- What is the cost to do a parks master plan and is it unusual for a city to prepare one? *Andrade-Wax indicated they were more common than not—the cost is usually \$50-100K, though it can be more depending on what it includes. For a City with no existing Plan, the cost is higher than just doing an update.*
- Is it overkill to do a Plan? *We already know what it takes to keep the parks healthy and safe.*
- The needs assessment helps us evaluate what we've got and what we need, and allow us to compare our city to others and to national standards.
- Would the scope include open spaces? *Yes. It can also include trails.*
- How long would it take? *About a year, though it can take longer. Funding may be available (through Measure A).*
- We should specifically include a timeline that says do it by 2025 (or sooner—2 or 3 years?) *Agreed. Until its done, we don't have a baseline for improvements.*
- How does the Parks Plan relate to Public Works policies regarding integrated pest management and invasive species, also how does the capital improvements program address this? *The Parks Master Plan will integrate all established park policies. Public Works benefits from this as well.*
- Will the needs assessment address the need for a Community Center in particular areas. They exist in Terra Linda, the Canal, etc. but there are none on the Point San Pedro Peninsula. *Susan said that would be done through the master plan. A survey will be done to determine what gaps exist, what the projections look like, and how needs will change over time. Pickleball and lacrosse are now the "in" sports—we need to study trends and determine what the needs will be in 10 or 20 years. PM Miller noted that the need for a Community Center could be called out in the Neighborhoods Element.*
- Why doesn't staff have a good enough handle on the trends already? *We have limited funds, we need to avoid too much bureaucracy. We are not contemplating large scale projects that warrant a big planning effort. One advantage of a Master Plan is that it can position the city for grants to improve existing facilities. Measure A only provides limited funding.*
- Director Andrade Wax noted that another advantage of a Master Plan is that it involves the entire community.
- The recommendations for specific parks in the 2020 plan came directly from the community during the 1999-2004 update process. If we remove this text from the General Plan before we have a Parks Plan, we will have nothing to go on and may jeopardize our eligibility for grants. The list can be easily updated. Look at the Windward Way site as an example of a recommendation in the 2020 Plan that needs to be retained. At least, keep a placeholder in the General Plan so that when the Master Plan is adopted we can amend the General Plan and update the priorities. It might be five or ten years before we do it. *PM Miller suggested some of these recommendations could be in the Neighborhoods Element.*
- We need to include the regional parks as well.
- This Element should provide guidance on biodiversity, native plants, and habitat since it addresses open space areas. These topics are not mentioned here. There are many things that can be done to make our parks more environmentally friendly. *PM Miller indicated there would be cross-references/ hyperlinks to other elements. He suggested the Committee could help identify where hyperlinks should go.*
- I agree with the prior speaker on retaining recommendations for specific neighborhoods. We should identify areas where there is no park. The "15-minute walk" standard is not enough. Montecito and Lincoln Hill are more than a 15 minute walk from any park, plus we have more density and lower income housing than we used to. Also, 15 minutes is different for a three-year old vs a 30-year old. Please keep the verbiage about Montecito needing a tot lot. There is no place to take a child to play in the

neighborhood. We can't set a 3-acre standard for every neighborhood park—there aren't enough sites. Tot lots are needed.

- There is no mention of Measure A and the criteria for using such funds.

PM Miller asked that the Committee discuss the proposed revision to the park standard (from 3 acres per 1,000 residents to 4.5 acres per 1,000 residents). He noted that the standard adopted in General Plan 2020 was less than what the City had currently, and less than what most cities used as their park standards. PM Miller noted that rental housing was exempt from the fee currently, and that would also be the case in the future. There would likely be an increased park fee for owner-occupied housing.

- Can we gear the exemptions around affordable housing instead of rental housing. *Yes, but most projects have a mix of affordable and market-rate units.*
- Adding a fee waiver for affordable could be an incentive to include more affordable housing.
- Does the park impact fee applies to commercial development? *Planning Manager Boloyan noted that San Rafael does not collect commercial impact fees for parks, and a nexus study would be required to do so.* A committee member suggested that the City look into this.
- The City should not add more fees on commercial development.
- I object to increasing the impact fees. We are not a fast-growing city and most new development is happening on previously developed properties. All we are talking about doing is making it more expensive to build anything. If we ask new development to shoulder the burden of paying for 4.5 acres of parkland (instead of 3.0) it would decrease the vitality of development. This is not looking ahead to the future. Raising the per capita ratio doesn't make sense.
- Perhaps the higher per capita standard makes more sense if applied to newly developing areas. For example, if the Rock Quarry is redeveloped, ask for 4.5 acres per 1,000 there—but don't require it Downtown. *Raffi noted that an in-lieu fee was more likely than on-site parkland for Downtown projects.*
- Standards and policies for parks should differentiate between new development (like the quarry) vs infill on 4th Street or upgrades to out-of-date buildings.
- I agree with the prior speaker that increased fees would be burdensome and would destroy our ability to create missing middle housing. The fees are designed to eliminate deficiencies yet the cumulative effects are damaging. We need to be very careful when suggesting higher fees. Some of the fees should be reduced if our objective is to provide housing.
- We have to be more careful about how we frame the policies so they do not discourage commercial investment and rehab of existing buildings.
- Upping the standard is just maintaining the status quo. But why would we exempt rental housing—it just pushes the cost burden onto single family homes and exempts most of the new housing that will be built in the future.
- What would the actual cost impact be of increasing the acreage ratio from 3 to 4.5. Barry noted that the new acreage standard was 50% higher, so the fee increase would likely be commensurate. However, he noted that the bigger issue is that the park fees have not been raised in a very long time and are only \$1,800 a dwelling unit. They are as high as \$20,000 a unit in some cities.
- We should explicitly state that Accessory Dwelling Units are exempt.
- Avoid raising fees from \$1,800 a unit to \$20,000 a unit.
- Are the open space policies coming back to us? When will we see those?
- How big is the park fee relative to other impact fees? Is it per acre or per unit? *It is per unit, based on the number of lots being created—but we haven't adjusted the value of land in awhile.*
- Planning Manager Boloyan explained that developers have the option of actually building a park on-site, in which case they don't have to pay a fee at all. It is currently not one of the bigger fees (compare to housing fees, school fees, or traffic fees).
- If we keep the standard at 3 acres per 1,000, how much will we reduce our park quality in the next 20 years as we grow? *The real impact of the standard comes when larger sites like the Rock Quarry are redeveloped. We are mostly talking about new parks—these fees can only be used for new parks or to improve existing parks. Developers can also provide "mini-parks."*

- Can we “split the difference” and give developers the option to provide some of the park standard through a mini-park and pay the rest in a fee? *This can be done through a development agreement.*

Susan indicated that park impact fees are the only funding source the City has right now for park acquisition or development. Measure A only provides \$120,000 a year. Maintenance comes from the General Fund.

B. Transportation Metrics Discussion

Chair Plante introduced Bob Grandy (Fehr and Peers Consulting) and Rafat Raie (Deputy Public Works Director). PM Miller provide an introduction to the topic, which relates to state requirements for measuring transportation impacts.

Bob reviewed the conclusions of a December City Council meeting on the issue of switching from Level of Service (LOS) to Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as the metric for measuring the traffic impacts of new plans, development projects, and transportation projects. He listed six topics addressed by the Council at their meeting in December. He recapped the City Council recommendations, including:

- Use a city-based VMT threshold instead of a regional one. The threshold itself should be set after the General Plan traffic modeling is done.
- Adopt screening criteria which would allow projects that generate low VMT to be exempted from VMT study requirements (such as local retail and projects near the transit center, or within the Precise Plan boundary).
- The new Marin Travel Model will be used for VMT forecasts.
- LOS should be retained as a planning tool—larger projects outside Downtown will still be required to calculate LOS and potentially mitigate congestion impacts through transportation improvements.

Rafat indicated there was no plan to abandon LOS. It simply will not be treated as a CEQA issue. LOS will still be used to negotiate mitigation measures to make sure when a project is built we still have a functioning transportation network. A parking and circulation study can still be required even if a project is exempt from VMT.

Chair Plante asked if the council defined what a “larger project” would be. Bob said that this had yet to be determined. She also asked if the standard would still be based on AM and PM peak. Bob said it depends on the project. Residential and office projects are analyzed based on AM and PM peak, but retail may be studied for Saturday peaks. Rafat said there are a lot of factors defining a larger project (proximity to transit amenities, size, etc.) — in the past the City has mandated a traffic report if a project would generate “100 new peak hour trips” (though this could be lowered to 50 in impacted areas).

Additional committee questions and comments were made:

- Will the 100 peak hour threshold be maintained? How are other cities defining “large projects” to determine when a traffic study is required. *Bob indicated that San Francisco, Oakland and San Jose all require local traffic assessments for projects—these cover only the blocks around the site. Oakland has high thresholds. San Jose’s approach is more nuanced and varies from area to area.*
- My concern about VMT is that it works in the big cities because they have robust transit. San Rafael doesn’t—we don’t even know where the transit center is going to be, and SMART has limited potential for growth. SMART and Marin Transit fall short and really can’t transform our city. Ridership has fallen and is trending down. Putting more housing downtown will only increase cars because you can’t force people to not drive, and our travel patterns are very diffuse. Meanwhile, how will San Rafael reduce the greenhouse gas impacts that result from more congestion? We have a state mandate but how will we deal with the GHG increase that comes with more idling? I am concerned about ideology versus reality. We

need to be real. We also need to use different thresholds in Terra Linda than in Downtown, since there is much less transit.

Bob noted that the intent of state law is to shift growth to cities with the best transit access and walkability—regionally, this means San Francisco San Jose and Oakland. At the local level, we just need to make sure that growth in San Rafael goes to the core areas where there are other travel options. For example, a home in Terra Linda generates twice the number of trips as a condo near transit in Downtown San Rafael.

Rafat noted that TOD is just one option to improve mobility. We are developing a list of capital improvement projects that also will improve all modes of transportation. We also have TDM programs and plans. Bob indicated that the common practice now is to provide both VMT and LOS information in CEQA documents. We have always calculated VMT for air quality and greenhouse gas emissions—we just haven't highlighted it as a transportation issue.

- There are projects in the pipeline that will be exempt from traffic study requirements since they are near the transit center. But they will still increase congestion. How can we require them to improve the intersections they will impact if we don't subject them to LOS? It seems that currently the Planning Commission doesn't have the authority to require mitigation. Can we at least require improvements to the four corners that abut the project? How can we get that authority? *Rafat noted that the Planning Commission does have the authority to require a project to be redesigned to reduce its impacts. Raffi noted that we cannot ask people to solve problems they did not create, which is often the situation where new development impacts intersections that are already over capacity. We have to demonstrate a nexus to ask for improvements. That is the purpose of the traffic impact fee. Raffi noted that the General Plan would include a list of projects that will mitigate expected future traffic. We can require fees, but the fees will likely not pay for it all. The awkward item is that VMT and LOS are in conflict in this situation.*
- It seems that there are conflicting directives and mixed signals. We are collecting fees to pay for projects that we will never have enough money to actually build. *We can't set the fees based on actual costs, because it's unfair to new development. Also, the amount of development we plan for in the General Plan is a maximum envelope—in reality, only some of this growth will occur.*
- SB 743 may work in a major city where there is ample transit, but we don't fit that model. I am concerned that we are dropping LOS for downtown and in station areas; the train doesn't go to where the jobs are. Don't abandon LOS downtown. Perhaps we should consider a moratorium on development until we see if Measure I passes? Do we have to wait until SMART dies to end the LOS exemption for Downtown—in other words, if Measure I fails, can we drop the exemption? Also--what has the actual usage of SMART been for those living near the station? The intersections near SMART are now at LOS E or F – but they didn't pay impact fees to fix the mess they created. We should also be respectful of people living in San Anselmo , who are being choked off by our traffic. *Rafat noted that SMART is federal, which means we have very little authority over them. We cannot impose a moratorium—we don't have that authority either. SMART is a reality—but they are working to mitigate by synching the train crossing. It is true that SMART does cause a loss of capacity on local streets. We don't have the percentage of new residents using SMART but we do know that a much larger percentage of those residents are likely to use the bus than ride the train.*

Given how new this all is, and how many unknowns there are, it was suggested that we include a program in the Plan to revisit our VMT requirement in 3 to 5 years. *Yes, staff agrees. And it would not require a General Plan Amendment to adjust the thresholds. We normally do check-ins on the General Plan every five years already anyway. There is still a lot of gray area on VMT that will require us to adjust the standards in the future.*

A committee member observed that this is similar to the approach we are taking for sea level rise.

Bob Grandy said we need to revisit the transportation network as a whole on a regular basis. Its very dynamic. We live in a time of accelerating change—we didn't have scooters and e-bikes 5 years ago—we

need to re-visit how we manage our network every 5 years. As we transition to increased demand for curbside space, autonomous vehicles, etc., we need to think in a more dynamic way. Rafat agreed that the concept of a dynamic system that is updated periodically is very important—we can link our review of VMT to the update of the TAM model (every 4 years).

A committee member asked what the remedy was for intersections that are currently at E or F? Traffic is the number issue in San Rafael, and folks want to know what we are doing about the failing intersections. Rafat indicated that there are some intersections where we've accepted LOS F and cannot improve them any further.

The following comments were made:

- There are trade-offs in this process. We can't build our way out of congestion in some locations—widening Downtown streets would be undesirable and disruptive. This was a tradeoff made in the 1990s when the Downtown Plan was adopted, and it was affirmed in 2004.
- The community doesn't know that.
- Lesser levels of service may be appropriate in Downtown because we're OK with cars going slower in this area.
- Another committee member who participated in General Plan 2020 noted that there was a conscious decision that congestion would be tolerated in certain areas because it would be death to the community to stop all development because of congestion.

Rafat noted that all of this points to the need to shift our focus to managing demand instead of increasing supply. If we build 10 lanes, they will fill up. Instead, we are focusing on building a Downtown where people can live without a car. A committee member observed that this did not help folks who lived in the city already, in neighborhoods that have no transit. The General Plan will include programs to improve transit and shift trips to non-peak hour.

The Committee took a 10-minute break after this item.

C. Mobility Element: Presentation and Discussion

Barry Miller provided an overview of the goals in the new Draft Mobility Element. The following comments were made after the presentation (staff responses made at the meeting are in italics):

- Goal M-2 should be expanded to add “efficiency”—part of our goal needs to be to use our resources efficiently. The word “efficiency” will help us maintain a cost-efficiency perspective instead of committing to serve all travelers without regard to cost.
- I disagree with adding efficiency—the focus is on mobility for all, and adding efficiency suggests we will tilt this toward a purely economic decision.
- Policy M-2.4 addresses service standards—when we will see them? We will still rely on LOS outside of Downtown—what will our standards be? *We haven't run the traffic model yet, so we don't know our standards yet. We are doing our traffic forecasting now. The Tables will be included in the next iteration of this Element, just as they are in General Plan 2020.*
- There is going to be a standard—correct? It is not entirely discretionary. *Yes. There will be standards for the intersections in the 2040 Plan just as there were for the 2020 Plan. Traffic studies may be discretionary, but the standards will be firm.*
- Will the Steering Committee have a chance to see the LOS standards before they are published in the Plan? *Yes*
- I have issues with Policies 2.3 and 6.9. They are similar. We need to add “safety” to 2.3 as a factor in the cost benefit analysis—we implement many projects to improve safety. Meanwhile, 6.9 should be deleted as it is problematic, as it basically sets up a scenario that evaluates bike and ped projects solely against the number of people they benefit. Projects can't be built if they negatively impact motorists? That conflicts with our safety goals—we can save lives by implementing policies that constrain motorists. *We will have*

a look at this—there was a strong thread of discussion at prior meetings about doing projects that benefit larger numbers of people.

- I don't have an issue with the idea of considering the number of beneficiaries when a project is built – that makes sense to me. However, I think this policy can be better developed and applied to other aspects of the General Plan process. Our resources are limited. We can make this work better—safety can be added without losing the gist of the policy. We should also apply cost-benefit thinking to greenhouse gas emission reduction. Take the steps that benefit the most and cost the least—how much benefit do we get when we add electric chargers (vs the cost)? What about other strategies?
- It is important that we don't think of this as simply a quantitative decision. We have had electric charging stations donated, for example. We need to be future oriented, and not solely focus on costs.
- We are not saying you have to pick the cheapest solution—we should just make decisions informed by cost and benefit data. The benefit may be that we are better prepared for the future.
- Part of our problem is that we've done all these plans by committees and advocates that have been working in silos. We have aspirations, which nobody disputes, but we can't afford them all. How do we choose?
- It's not purely cost driven—it's just awareness of the cost. Council should have data and metrics rather than just making decisions because it's trendy or feels right.
- With respect to regional leadership, we need to advocate on regional issues and not just things in our own border. We should advocate for things in the City's interest that extend beyond our borders. For example, 101 and 580 is a regional project, but we should be advocating for it to benefit East San Rafael. I will take a shot at some revisions. It should be about advocacy and not just coordination.
- The discussion of intermodal transit hubs should acknowledge the potential for water transportation. Perhaps add water taxis from Point San Pedro to Downtown and the ferry terminal.
- The Mobility Element adds a huge amount of regulation. I am fearful that we won't be able to do anything, including the City, if we adopt all these requirements. It will be too expensive—and much less will get done.
- It costs four times as much to build a unit of infrastructure in the US compared to the European Union. Our project delivery costs are very expensive.
- Goals M-3 (reduced emissions) and M-4 (transit) are very important. I support these goals. The discussion of TDM is particularly important and fits in well with our strategy to reduce vehicle miles traveled.
- It's challenging, though, because we cannot force people to use TDM measures. We can only make them available.
- Transit passes are a good example.
- The only way to increase "supply" on our roads, since we have limited opportunities to widen them, is to add buses and trains.
- Can we be more explicit about transit passes instead of using terms like TDM? *Barry classified what TDM is—it is not about making driving more expensive. It's about providing more choices, making it easier to work remotely, flextime, etc.*
- In San Rafael, we don't have that many large employers. With smaller firms, we can't dictate all these requirements. We tried this in the 90s and it failed. Little companies can't afford this. The average company in San Rafael has only 10 people. The programs are great in theory, but they cost a lot.
- The Plan's TDM recommendations should state that one size doesn't fit all when it comes to this stuff. There are things that small firms can do that contribute to trip reduction.
- What failed in the 1990s is that we REQUIRED it, and it required staffing that became unsustainable. There's nothing wrong with encouraging it—it doesn't have to be mandated. Words like "support" and "encourage" are appropriate here.
- How will the General Plan deal with the cumulative impacts of traffic? There are 50 units proposed at 350 Merrydale in a former furniture store. It's near SMART but not on a bus line or a main street. What if 65% of the residents drive instead of taking the bus or train? That adds more vehicle trips to a road that's already crowded. It will worsen the 101 traffic and clog the on-ramp and cause more idling and

GHGs. There may not be an economic value associated with environmental costs and social costs. If we are increasing density in places where the transit is not effective, we are not addressing the issues.

- Program M-1.3A addresses n/b 101 to e/b 580 but it should also look at improving s/b 101 to e/b 580. That also needs improvements and would have design implications. Also, there should be some mention of the reconstruction of Hwy 37, and also text advocating for reasonable compromises regarding the third lane on the westbound Richmond Bridge during the AM peak. It may also be good to discuss the projects listed in Exhibit 19 of the Plan (M-2.8). Also, I am disappointed that the pedestrian and bike goals were merged together. Now the focus is heavily on the bicycles and the pedestrians get lost. Need to separate them again. Give pedestrians more focus. I also really endorse the roundabout mention and the Vision Zero program. Please move that up. Also, a lot of what's in the North San Rafael letter can be easily addressed; they deserve consideration.
- Goal 4 (transit) is mostly the purview of other agencies. There is very little that the City can do on transit. Incentives to use transit are not enough—we also need to discourage people from driving, which is something the City CAN do. Are we proposing these kinds of policies? If we do, how can we ensure that transit agencies prioritize the right projects?
- I am against expanding the parking district until you show me what the benefit is and what the cost will be. We need to increase the parking supply—the transit station and Montecito area is already underserved.
- Right now, North San Rafael people don't even go Downtown because there is not enough parking.
- If we expand the parking district, we need to commit to increasing the supply of spaces. *But there is a trade-off, because increasing parking will increase traffic.*
- We should adopt a “park once” policy—a guidance system should tell us where to park, leave the car there, and then do everything. Don't drive around looking for a “unicorn” of a space. Increasing supply may not be needed if we can direct people easily to where the supply is.
- I served on the Parking and Wayfinding Committee. The consultant concluded that we have too much parking, which is false. The problem is we have excess supply in areas where there is low demand, and no supply in the places where we need it. Also, the analysis doesn't recognize that women don't park in garages because of personal security issues. The consultant finally admitted that there is nowhere to park in the eastern part of Downtown, and that the focus should be on directing people to nearby garages.
- There are limited opportunities to build a garage in East San Rafael. *PM Miller noted that one option could be to set aside public spaces in private garages serving new development.*
- Consider oversizing parking for private development so that the City can operate one level (the developer pays for the foundation and the basic structure, but the City pays for an additional story, etc.)
- Don't plan our parking solutions around one tenant.
- Can we negotiate an approval condition when we allow development that some public parking is provided? Can we require that this condition be carried over to future property owners?
- Can we launch a campaign to “make riding the bus cool again”? The bus has a negative stigma. People think it's just for people in the Canal.
- The adults are not modeling this behavior—they are driving, so how will they convince their kids to ride the bus?
- The Committee's new youth representative noted that there is a large population of students who might ride the bus and be convinced that it's cool, but there is a lot of peer pressure to drive. The City is car-oriented.
- There is a lot of bullying and harassment of teens, which is an obstacle to encouraging them to ride the bus. Adults also harass kids on the bus. This was studied already, and there are findings.

Barry asked that comments on the Mobility policies be submitted by January 31.

(6) COMMITTEE ALTERNATE COMMENTS

There were no Alternates in the audience.

(7) PUBLIC COMMENTS

Lori Perini commented on the Committee's conversation about getting high school students to ride the bus to school. There is a truancy issue at Terra Linda-- if taking the bus isn't cool, maybe we can develop an app to get students to ride cars together. The buses are not a reliable way to get to school; they get you there late.

Shirley Fischer pointed out that Policy M-2.6 allows exceptions to LOS standards under rather vague and subjective conditions. This has been a problem for many years. Can we adopt more measurable and objective criteria for when LOS can be exceeded?

(8) GENERAL BUSINESS ITEMS

Barry announced that the next meeting was on February 12 and would cover Community Design and Economic Vitality. The Steering Committee will have four more meetings before it concludes its work. He reviewed the schedule for the remaining meetings. He also noted that staff was taking the Draft Land Use Map to the Planning Commission on February 11.

(9) ADJOURNMENT

It was announced that local housing advocate David Coury had passed away. The meeting was adjourned in his memory at 9:00 PM.