



MEMORANDUM

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: ANDREW PEREZ, ASSOCIATE PLANNER

SUBJECT: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION FOR AGENDA ITEM 9.a. – APRIL 20, 2021 PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING: CONSIDERATION OF A PROJECT STATUS UPDATE REGARDING THE CIRCULATION ELEMENT UPDATE; GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT 20-001

DATE: APRIL 20, 2021

Attached are comments received after agenda preparation regarding the proposed project.

cc: Community Development Director
Public Review Binder

Andrew Perez

From: pc publiccomment
To: Andrew Perez
Subject: RE: Public Comment for Circulation Element, Planning Commission Item 9a, Meeting 4/20/2021

From: Steven Dunbar [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, April 17, 2021 1:05 PM
To: public comment <publiccomment@arroyogrande.org>
Cc: Bill Robeson <brobeson@arroyogrande.org>; Jill McPeck <jmcpeek@arroyogrande.org>
Subject: Public Comment for Circulation Element, Planning Commission Item 9a, Meeting 4/20/2021

Hello Arroyo Grande Planning Commissioners and Staff,

Please accept my thanks for the work completed thus far in the Circulation Element update and responding to many of the comments I have made via the feedback tools.

As someone who rode his bicycle to Paulding and AGHS because only 1 parent drives, as an environmentalist, and as someone who sees my mom getting back on her trike in AG after many years, I know that a high quality circulation element is absolutely critical to city planning. Furthermore, as the city climate action plan notes, 44% of AG's emissions are from transportation. Transportation policy is climate policy.

I am pleased to hear that an Active Transportation Plan (ATP) update is recommended, because an update is sorely needed. The city isn't competitive for grants with such an out of date plan, and even beyond city-initiated projects, infrastructure provided by private development could be of higher perceived comfort and quality with modern design standards and guidelines enforced - see the rather narrow "door zone"-ish bike lanes on East Cherry.

I am also happy to see that the ATP process has specific goals, such as identifying a low stress network, and integrating safety improvements within maintenance projects as a standard operating procedure.

I offer you the following suggestions on the current draft plan:

1) Draft a strong vision statement. Staff suggested they were open to a vision recommendation in response to someone else's comment.

As such, here is my recommendation that you are free to use or modify:

The core value of this Circulation Element is to provide safe, sustainable, comfortable, convenient, and predictable travel within and through the City for all roadway users. The circulation element reinforces and enhances the Land Use Element by equitably linking housing, employment, community, and recreation together.

(added sustainable and comfortable, removed "easy" in favor of "convenient" and "predictable", changed "peds/bikes/motor vehicles" to "all roadway users", modified last sentence to match better)

2) Staff mentioned many of my comments were overly specific. That feedback is correct, and made me reconsider my approach. Ironically, I have come to use the same point against the current draft: I believe we're actually mapping the "wrong thing" when we map proposed pedestrian improvements, proposed bike lane

classifications, and even proposed number of travel lanes in a circulation element. Those maps are overly specific. A good example is that I don't believe a Bike Boulevard is really the most feasible option to reduce LTS on Branch Street through downtown.

I actually think these maps should be removed and replaced by other displays (although I know roadway classifications are important for other reasons). These are: Goal roadway level of service, Goal or expected roadway ADT volume, Goal pedestrian level of service, and Goal bicycle level of traffic stress. This will help guide staff through the ATP process in the future while requiring less rewriting of the circulation element as the ATP is completed. These could be generalized to particular corridors if alternative routes are available, as well.

Pedestrian Level of Service was not mentioned in the document, but it could be generally summarized and then analyzed as part of the ATP.

3) I would specifically ask that public transit stop design guidance be updated with the ATP update, including amenities, level boarding, and other features as appropriate. Alternatively, SLORTA could be tasked with updating standards, but detailed integration of standards needs to be facilitated between SLORTA and the design documents that city staff uses on a daily basis.

4) Finally, a parting "specific" feedback: I understand well that CalTrans will push for their interchange to be brought up to modern standards. However, that will likely cost tens to hundreds of millions of dollars. I've seen CalTrans push to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to raise an interchange, only to back down when pressed on how many trucks actually needed that extra few inches (which is already above the legal height). That is to say, CalTrans doesn't do a good job of value engineering relative to all of the local needs. There is only so much money to go around, and therefore my request is: Please carefully consider the cost / benefit of a new interchange near Traffic Way. If CalTrans wants to pay for literally all of it, that is their business, but I believe AG has much better ways to make a "Strong Town."

As you'll notice, I am familiar with the commitment you have to making AG a better place - it truly is a public service. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Steven Dunbar
In my personal capacity only

For reference:
Vice Chair, Planning Commission, City of Livermore
Board Secretary, Bike East Bay
AGHS '12