



## Chapter 7 Circulation Element PC Final PC Markup 1-20-11


**NOTE: Black text** denotes staff's original policy language (strikethrough/underline illustrates changes from posted documents).  
**Red text** denotes changes made by the Complete Street Working Group (CSWG).  
**Green text** denotes changes made by the Planning Commission.




Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>7.4 Goals</b>		
A	B	C		<b>C-G1. Circulation System Safety and Functionality.</b> A <u>safe, <del>and</del> efficient, <del>and</del> convenient</u> circulation <del>transportation</del> system that is safe, efficient, and provides good access <u>for people of all ages, economic means and abilities</u> to all cities, communities, neighborhoods, recreational facilities and adjoining regions.	Recommended grammatical changes.	<b>M Vote 6-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-14-10</b> <b>C. Gearheart – I agree with staff that it should be shorter and more succinct but can support the working groups suggest.</b> <b>All in support. (C. Mayo is absent)</b>		
A	B	C		<b>C-G2. Balanced Transportation Opportunities.</b> A transportation system <u>consisting of “complete streets”</u> that <u>ensures the availability of options among modes of travel by integrating and balancing</u> <del>integrates and balances</del> the <u>context-specific</u> needs of motorized vehicles, public transit, bicycles, <u>wheelchairs disabled people</u> and pedestrians <u>on all roadways and facilities</u> .		<b>M Vote 3-2-1</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-14-10</b> <b>Commissioner Faust requested eliminating “consisting of complete streets” and “on all roadways and facilities”.</b> <b>Commissioners Emad, Krebs and Gearheart supported Commissioner Faust’s recommendation but wanted to change “wheelchair” to “disabled people”.</b> <b>C. Smith and C. Nelson support staff’s original wording.</b>		
A	B	C		<b>C-G3. Interagency Cooperation.</b> Coordinated planning between transportation system service providers and HCAOG for improved system design, development, operations, and maintenance.		<b>R Vote 6-0</b>


Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-14-10</b> <b>All support as written.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-G4. <del>Healthy Active</del> Transportation.</b> Increased participation in bicycling, horseback riding, and hiking activities providing physical, social, environmental, and economic benefits for County residents and tourists.	New recommended Alt. B (re-written version of Alt. D 4310.2. below)	<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>5-1</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-14-10</b> <b>Commissioner Kreb, Gearheart, Emad, Faust, and Smith supported a new name for C-G4 with staff's original language and the recommendation that CSWG's wording be made into a new goal (see C-GX).</b> <b>Commissioner Nelson supported staff's original version or option "D". 5/1</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-GX. Healthy Transportation.</b> Improved ability of residents to shift short trips from motorized to non-motorized modes; increases participation in walking, bicycling, horseback riding, public transit and hiking activities; and provide social, environmental, economic, and health benefits for County residents and tourists.	<b>New goal as recommended by the Planning Commission.</b>	<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>5-1</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-14-10</b> <b>See comments for C-G4</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-GXX. Transportation Security.</b> <del>Improve safe access to basic goods, services, health care, schools, employment and recreation, particularly in areas where there are high occurrences of vulnerable or car-less populations.</del>	<b>New Goal by CSWG</b>	<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>6-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-14-10</b> <b>Chairman Smith recommended the removal of the word "improve" at the beginning of the sentence and also the deletion of everything after the word "recreation".</b> <b>The Commission unanimously supported this recommendation by a vote of 6/0.</b>		
			<b>D</b>	<b>4220</b> To develop, operate and maintain a well-coordinated, balanced, circulation system that is safe, efficient and provides good access to all cities, communities, neighborhoods, recreational facilities and adjoining regions		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4310.1.</b> To provide guidelines for establishing a safe, efficient, and enjoyable County		<b>D</b>


Plan Alternative			Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			trails program for the transportation and recreation needs of bicyclists, equestrians, hikers, and joggers.		
		D	<b>4310.2.</b> To increase participation in bicycling, horseback riding, and hiking activities which can provide physical, social, environmental, and economic benefits for County residents and tourists.		D
			<b>7.4 Policies</b>		
A	B	C	<p><b>C-P1. Orderly Development.</b> Encourage development of a <del>road</del> <b>circulation</b> <del>transportation</del> <b>circulation</b> system that supports an orderly pattern of land use <del>by</del> through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Using minor collector roads to provide access to higher density residential areas, local commercial facilities, neighborhood parks, and schools <u>while maintaining maximum bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and access.</u></li> <li>B. Designing access to residential areas to minimize disruptions to the flow of traffic <u>while ensuring user safety and connectivity</u> on arterial or collector roads. Avoid, <del>when feasible,</del> direct residential driveway access off of arterials and <del>major</del> collectors.</li> <li>C. <u>Improving connectivity between interrelated areas such as</u> <del>Connectivity between</del> neighborhoods and <u>common</u> destinations.</li> <li>D. Locating retail, service and industrial facilities, community centers, <del>major</del> recreational facilities, employment centers, and other intensive land uses near <del>major</del> collectors or arterial roads.</li> <li>E. Improving <del>roads</del> <b>multimodal</b> <del>transportation infrastructure</del> to accommodate existing land uses served by a sub-standard road classification.</li> <li>F. <u>Using multi-use transportation hubs to serve town-centers, neighborhoods and other common destinations.</u></li> <li>G. <u>Enhancing pedestrian and bicycle access to employment, services and recreation.</u></li> <li>H. <u>Locating multi-family residential, commercial and public use facilities in areas serviced by public transit.</u></li> </ul>	<p>Recommended grammatical changes and addition of items F and G.</p> <p>Leg, S1-2, IM1</p> 	M Vote 3-2

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				I. <u>Encouraging building, fence, façade, and setback design that promotes comfortable pedestrian environments.</u>		
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10 (Commissioners Gearheart and Smith were excused)</b>                      Supervising Planner Tom Hofweber explained that staff recommended the Commission keep the word "circulation" instead of "transportation" and in (E) staff thought the word multi-modal was extraneous. Staff was otherwise in support of the recommendations of the CSWG.</p> <p><u>Straw vote</u>  <b>Commissioners Kreb and Faust supported the recommendations by CSWG and retaining the words 'circulation' and 'multi-modal'.</b>  <b>Commissioners Emad, Nelson and Mayo supported the staff recommendation of deleting these words.</b></p>		
			D	<p><b>4231.8.</b> Encourage the development of a road system that supports an orderly pattern of land use through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Using minor collector roads to provide access to higher density residential areas, local commercial facilities, neighborhood parks and schools.</li> <li>B. Locating lower density residential areas with frontage onto arterial or major collector roads away from through-traffic unless sufficient mitigation measures are used.</li> <li>C. Locating retail, service and industrial facilities, community centers, major recreational facilities, employment centers, and other intensive land uses near major collector, or arterial roads.</li> <li>D. Improving roads to accommodate land uses served by an inappropriate road classification</li> </ul>		D
A	B	C		<p><b>C-P2. Consideration of Land Uses in Transportation Decision Making.</b> Transportation decisions <del>in urban and rural areas</del> shall be based on a comprehensive planning approach that considers existing land uses and future land development as proposed in adopted County plans and plans of other governmental agencies.</p>	Leg, QJ, Min, IM4 	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Vote</b>  <b>3-2</b></p>


Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10</b>  <b>Commissioners Kreb, Emad and Faust supported staff's recommendation to accept the Complete Streets WG's revisions as written.</b>  <b>Commissioners Mayo and Nelson supported changing the word 'shall' to 'should'.</b></p>		
			D	<p><b>4237.1.</b> Transportation decisions in urban and rural areas should be based on a comprehensive planning approach that considers at a minimum existing land uses and future land development as proposed in adopted County plans and plans of other governmental agencies.</p>		D
				<p><b>COMMENTS:</b></p>		
			D	<p><b>4237. 3.</b> Land use plans and policies shall be the basis for transportation facilities development.</p>		D
	B			<p><b>C-P3. Consideration of Transportation Impacts in Land Use Decision Making.</b>                      Decisions to change or expand the land use of a particular area <del>shall</del> <b>should</b> include an analysis of the impacts to existing and proposed transportation facilities and services so as to minimize or avoid significant operational or economic consequences.</p>	Leg, QJ, Min, S3, 	M Vote 2-2-1
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10</b>  <b>Commissioners Mayo and Nelson supported B version with the word 'should' instead of 'shall' as recommended by the HAR.</b>  <b>Commissioners Kreb and Faust supported the A version as modified by the CSWGete Streets as the preferred alternative.</b>  <b>Commissioners Emad Supported B Version as written.</b></p>		
	A			<p><b>C-P3. Consideration of Transportation Impacts in Land Use Decision Making.</b>                      Decisions to change or expand the land use of a particular area shall include an analysis of the impacts to existing and proposed transportation facilities and services so as to minimize or avoid significant operational, <u>environmental, or economic, and health-related</u> consequences. <u>and promote healthful transportation alternatives.</u></p>	See <u>underline</u> text for differences with Alternative B.	M Vote 2-2-1
				<p><b>COMMENTS: see comments above.</b></p>		



Plan Alternative		Chapter 7 Circulation Element		Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		C	D	<b>4237. 2.</b> Decisions to change or expand the land use of a particular area should include an analysis of the impacts to existing and/or proposed transportation facilities and services so as to minimize or avoid serious operational or economic consequences	D
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>	
	B		<b>C-P4. Mitigation Measures.</b> New development shall be conditioned to proportionally mitigate significant traffic impacts through construction of on- and off-site improvements and dedication of rights-of-way.	QJ, Min, S3 	R Vote 3/2
			<b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10</b> Staff recommended the CSWG changes in A as the preferred alternative. <u>Straw vote</u> <b>Commissioners Mayo, Emad and Nelson supported version B as written.</b> <b>Commissioners Faust and Kreb supported the “A” version recommendations by CSWG.</b>		
A			<b>C-P4. Mitigation Measures.</b> New development shall be conditioned to proportionally mitigate significant <del>traffic transportation-related</del> impacts through construction of on- and off-site <u>multi-modal</u> improvements, dedication of rights-of-way, <u>and/or reduce reduction of vehicular</u> transportation demand through mixed-use development <u>and other transportation demand management strategies. or bicycle, pedestrian and public transit improvements.</u>	See <u>underline</u> text for differences with Alternative B. 	D
			<b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10: See comments above.</b>		
A	B		<b>C-P5. Level of Service Criteria.</b> The County shall <del>strive endeavor to manage its streets and highway system so as to</del> maintain Level of Service C operation on all roadway segments, except for <del>any portion of</del> U.S. 101, where Level of Service D shall be acceptable. Calculation of Level of Service shall be based upon <del>V/C Ratios as described in C-S4, or other methods acceptable to Public Works.</del> Cumulative impacts to <del>target</del> levels of service shall also be considered in project review and addressed through the use of development impact fees. <u>Level of Service improvements for</u>	Recommended grammatical changes removal of unnecessary text. QJ, Min, S3 	M Vote 4-1



Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p><u>automobiles shall not adversely affect Level of Service and/or Quality of Service for other modes of transportation.</u>  <u>(see P25 – bring reference up to P5)</u></p>		
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10</b>  <b>Commissioners Krebs, Emad, Faust, Nelson</b> supported the recommendation by CSWG with the caveat to develop a standard based on the recommendations made by Public Works.  <b>Commissioner Mayo</b> supported staff's original recommendation including sub criteria.</p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<p><b>C-P6. Jurisdictional Coordination and Integration.</b> Use <u>HCOAG HCAOG</u>, formal Memorandums of Understanding, and informal project level cooperation to integrate countywide land use and transportation planning and implementation efforts. <del>Work towards adoption of Adopt</del> consistent transportation standards and roadway functional classifications between jurisdictions and Caltrans.</p>	Prog, IM4	<b>M Vote 5-0</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10</b>  <b>Unanimous support of the recommendation by CSWG.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<p><b>C-P7. Joint Use of Traffic Models.</b> Integrate transportation planning and analysis through joint use of area-wide traffic models such as the Greater Eureka Area Travel Model (GEATM). <u>Develop travel demand models with methods and inputs that incorporate walking, biking and transit.</u> Support coordination with agencies to maintain the accuracy and utility of such models.</p>	Prog, IM4 	<b>M Vote 5-0</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-21-10</b>  <b>Unanimous support of the recommendation by CSWG.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<p><b>C-P8. Coordination Between County Agencies.</b> County Public Works, Health and Human Services, and Community Development Services departments shall coordinate with each other <b>to ensure that</b> <del>encourage</del> uniform implementation of circulation policies.</p>	Prog, IM6	<b>M Vote 5-2</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10:</b>                  There was concern that the word "encourage" was not strong enough for this policy. The Director suggested the use of the word "ensure".</p>		


Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p><b>Straw vote</b>  <b>Commissioners Emad, Mayo, Gearheart, Smith and Nelson supported C-P8 with the replacement of the word 'encourage' with the word 'ensure'.</b>  <b>Commissioners Kreb and Faust, supported C-P8 as written.</b></p>		
			D	<p><b>4237. 5.</b> The Circulation corridor requirements shall be consistent with expected traffic volumes.</p>		D
			D	<p><b>4237. 6.</b> County roads identified by the Public Facilities Plan Maps require improvements and roadway dedications as conditions of development as specified by Minimum Corridor Standards (see the standards 4240)</p>		D
			D	<p><b>4237. 7.</b> New development shall only be approved which will not significantly create or aggravate safety, capacity or parking problems on County roads.</p>		D
			D	<p><b>4237. 8.</b> Community Plans shall include a Circulation Plan which:                      A. Establishes future locations of major roadways.                      B Minimizes dead end roads.                      C. Sets requirements clearly connecting future land use developments with the provision of an adequate circulation system.                      D. Considers designation of parking districts where in-lieu fees may be collected for a specified parking area.</p>		D
			D	<p><b>4237. 9.</b> All circulation planning shall be based on the County's very limited ability to construct new projects. To the maximum extent feasible, necessary circulation routes and facilities shall be obtained as a condition of approval for land development projects.</p>		D
A				<p><b>C-Px. Circulation Planning for Bicycles, Pedestrians and Transit.</b> Circulation planning and discretionary project review shall include an assessment of quality of service for bicycle, pedestrian and public transit access.</p>	Leg, QJ 	R Vote 6/1
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10:</b>  <b>Commissioners Kreb, Nelson, Emad, Faust, Smith and Gearheart supported Px as written and recommended that it would be added to Alternative B (Proposed Plan).</b>  <b>Commissioner Mayo could support the policy if it included equestrian use.</b></p>		
A	B			<p><del><b>C-Pxi. Information Technology. – The County shall use geospatial and information</b></del></p>		D





Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<del>technologies to create mobility management solutions that increase efficiency of vehicle traffic, reduce peak-hour automobile travel demand and make public transit and active transportation more convenient and desirable. Information and Geospatial technologies should be incorporated into adaptive management strategies in data collection, analysis, and implementation measures.</del>		Vote 5-2
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b>                      Staff commented that this is a process the County currently implements and is unnecessary as a policy.  <u>Straw vote</u>                      Commissioners Gearheart, Emad, Nelson, Smith and Mayo supported deleting Pxi                      Commissioners Faust and Kreb suggested the CSWG come back with the suggested policy as an implementation measure with an explanation of why it should be included.</p>		
			D	<b>4237. 10.</b> Access to public transit, bicycle parking and carpool parking should all be considered in circulation planning.		D
				<b>Roadway Infrastructure</b>		
A	B	C		<p><b>C-P9. Acceptance of Roads into the County Maintained Road System.</b> <del>Roads whose alignments are part of the Circulation Element (generally arterial and collector roads) that are roads, constructed to County standards, approved by the Department of Public Works shall be recommended to the Board of Supervisors for inclusion into the County Maintained Road System. Roads that are constructed to County standards and approved by the Department of Public Works that are not a part of the Circulation Element, and are not arterial or collector roads, Other roads shall not be recommended for acceptance into the County Maintained Road System unless an exception for public interest is supported by Public Works and adequate funding for the future maintenance of the road and its associated facilities is provided. subject to approval of the Department of Public Works.</del></p>	Edited for brevity. Leg, QJ, Min 	M Vote 6-1
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b>  <u>Straw vote</u>                      Commissioners Gearheart, Kreb, Emad, Faust, Smith and Mayo supported C-P9 as</p>		


Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				modified by staff. Commissioner Nelson did not support C-P9 (he could support if the County would not abandon the road without a lot of public input).		
A	B	C		<b>C-P10. Right-of-Ways as Public Facilities.</b> Road and rail right-of-ways are hereby <del>planned</del> <b>designated</b> as Public Facilities (PF), as per the Land Use Element, whether or not specifically mapped.	Leg	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b> Commissioner <b>Kreb, Faust, Emad, Nelson and Mayo</b> supported P-10 with the suggested change in wording of 'designated' to 'planned' suggested by Director Girard Commissioner <b>Gearheart</b> supported P-10 with either the words 'designated' or 'planned'.		
A	B	C		<b>C-P11. Roadway Functional Classifications.</b> Adopt and consistently apply <del>"complete streets"</del> roadway design and right-of-way standards according to functional classifications that <b>consider all modes of travel in the context of road location and applied usage. -distinguish between the needs of Urban Development Areas and rural areas.</b>	Leg, QJ, Min, S1, IM1 	<b>M Vote 3-2-2</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b> Commissioners <b>Gearheart, Smith and Emad</b> supported the recommendation of the CSWG with the deletion of the words 'Complete Streets' suggested by Commissioner Gearheart. Commissioners <b>Kreb and Faust</b> supported the recommendations of Complete Streets with the revision. Commissioners <b>Mayo and Nelson</b> supported not eliminating the words '...distinguish between needs of urban development areas and rural areas...'		
A	B			<b>C-P12. Multi-modal Level of Service/Quality of Service Criteria.</b> The County shall specify and endeavor to maintain minimum <b>multi-modal</b> Levels of Service (LOS) <b>and Quality of Service (QOS) standards</b> on County roads and use LOS/ <b>QOS</b> criteria as a basis for analyzing impact fees and assessments, prioritizing congestion relief projects, and evaluating cumulative traffic impacts of discretionary development.	QJ, Min, S3, IM2 	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>



Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b>                      All support the CSWG revisions (noted in red).</p>		
A	B	C		<p><b>C-P13. Prioritization of Investments.</b> Use objective criteria consistent with this Plan that can be applied uniformly and countywide to prioritize <del>roadway transportation</del> capital and maintenance expenditures.</p>	Prog, S5-6,	M Vote 7-0
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10:</b>                      All support the CSWG revisions (noted in red).</p>		
A	B			<p><b>C-P14. Efficiency and Capacity.</b> Manage roadway systems <del>and congestion relief projects</del> for increased transportation <del>options and</del> efficiency through multi-modal <del>demand management and transportation use demand management</del> before increasing capacity through roadway widening or new road construction.</p>	Prog 	M Vote 7-0
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b>                      There was concern that the language added by the CSWG was wordy and confusing. Director Girard suggested the following revision ‘...through multi modal demand management and transportation...’  <u>Straw vote</u>                      Unanimous support of language recommended by Director Girard, CSWG changes, and staff revisions to CSWG language (in yellow highlight).</p>		
A	B	C		<p><b>C-P15. <del>Roadway Condition Thresholds. Roadway and Multi-modal Facility Maintenance.</del></b> Use objective roadway condition measures and thresholds to prioritize maintenance <del>and rehabilitation</del> projects. <del>including active transportation infrastructure such as bike lanes and sidewalks</del>. Work to reduce overall deferred maintenance liability.</p>	Prog, S4, S6 	M Vote 5-2
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b>                      Director Girard suggested a new title that reads ‘<b>Roadway and Multi-modal Facility Maintenance</b>’ and a return to the original policy language as follows ‘Use objective roadway condition measures and thresholds to prioritize maintenance projects. Work to reduce overall deferred maintenance liability.’</p>		

Plan Alternative		Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		<p><u>Straw vote</u>                      Commissioners Smith, Emad, Mayo, Nelson, and Gearheart supported the suggested language by Director Girard.                      Commissioners Krebs, Faust, supported as revised by CSWG.</p>		
A	B	<p><del>C-P16. Public Input.</del> Public input shall be sought and considered in the development of <del>district plans, specific transportation related projects and</del> the Capital Improvement Program.</p>	Prog, S5	D Vote 5-2
		<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b>                      After discussion, it was recommended by Counsel to eliminate this policy as it is redundant. The Capital Improvement Program is approved by the BOS during the budget hearings which contains a public hearing process.  <u>Straw vote</u>                      Commissioners Gearheart, Emad, Mayo, Krebs and Faust supported eliminating C-P16. Commissioners Smith and Nelson supported staff's original language.</p>		
	B	<p><del>C-P17. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements.</del> The County supports a strategy for improvements to the U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor that minimizes impacts to coastal resources, and treats all three main roads between Arcata and Eureka as one system (U.S. Highway 101, State Route 255, and Old Arcata Road/Myrtle Avenue.) The strategy would develop an overall multi modal improvement plan considering motorized and non-motorized transportation that phases improvements on a prioritized basis between the three roads.; U.S. Highway 101, State Route 255, and Old Arcata Road/Myrtle Avenue.</p>	Recommended grammatical changes. IM10 	D – see Alt A policy
		<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10 see discussion under C-P17, Alternative A</b>                      .</p>		
A		<p><b>C-P17. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements.</b> The County supports a strategy for improvements to the U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor that minimizes impacts to coastal resources, <u>improves safety and connectivity for non-motorized transportation modes, and minimizes adverse impacts to parallel routes and treats all three main roads between Arcata and Eureka as one system (U.S. Highway 101, State Route 255, and Old Arcata Road/Myrtle Avenue.)</u> <del>The strategy would develop an</del></p>	Alt. A adds language to maintain or enhance bicycle and pedestrian access to Highway	M Vote 5-1-1

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><del>overall multi-modal improvement plan considering motorized and non-motorized transportation that phases improvements on a prioritized basis between the three roads. ;U.S. Highway 101, State Route 255, and Old Arcata Road/Myrtle Avenue.</del>  <u>Corridor improvements that could create adverse impacts to bicycle and pedestrian use, such as a resumption of state highway speeds or intersection modifications, shall be designed with offsetting mitigations or enhancements consistent with Cal Trans Complete Streets Deputy Directive DD-64-R1 or successor policies. The <b>strategy improvements</b> shall include a separated Class I Facility for non-motorized users parallel to the US 101 Safety Corridor.</u></p>	<p>101 as a part of the proposed corridor improvement project.</p>	
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 10-28-10</b>                      The Commissioners requested clarification for the reference to <u>Deputy Directive DD-64-R1</u> as referred to by CSWG in their revisions to the Alternative A policy.  <b>Director Girard</b> explained there was a “do no harm” clause in which Caltrans could not degrade the use for pedestrian or bicyclist for any highway improvements and that it was a pointed policy.  <b>Commissioner Faust</b> spoke the need for a serious multi-modal pathway between Arcata and Eureka. He felt strongly that there should be a safe separate multi-modal pathway that would serve Arcata, Eureka and the entire county.  <b>10-28-10 Straw vote</b>  <b>Unanimous support to rewrite A; to support a separate multi-modal pathway along the safety corridor.</b></p>		
	<p><b>12-9-10</b>                      Staff returned with revised wording (as prepared by the CSWG).                      C. Faust recommended minor revisions (see revisions in green above).                      C. Smith was concerned that the direction the County would be giving to Caltrans on corridor improvements could “hold hostage” a good project because they would have to develop a trail first, and may potentially “kill” road projects that improves safety.  <b>Straw vote</b>  <b>Commissioners Nelson, Krebs, Gearheart, Emad, and Faust (as long as the improvements include a Class 1 facility) supported the policy with the proposed language revisions.</b></p>		

Plan Alternative		Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		<b>Chairman Smith did not support the recommended policy revisions. He supported B. Commission Mayo abstained; he requested that the Director of Caltrans appear before the Commission prior to his voting.</b>		
A	B	<b>C-P18. Coordination with School Districts.</b> The County shall coordinate with school districts on new school site locations, opening or re-using closed school sites, and significant changes in attendance levels or hours of operation to minimize traffic impacts and promote multi-modal school site access. <u>The County shall actively consider non-motorized improvements around schools and seek funding through Safe Routes to Schools Programs and other funding sources.</u>	Prog	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
		<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10: Unanimous support of language recommended by CSWG.</b>		
A	B	<b>C-P19. Best Management Practices for Road Grading.</b> New development subject to the grading ordinance shall use best management practices <del>as described in the Grading Ordinance</del> to prevent soil erosion and minimize impacts to watersheds from grading activities.	QJ, Min, Prog 	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
		<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> C. Smith concerned with the "best practices" being tied to the County's Grading Ordinance. These change regularly based upon state (in particular, RWQCB) law and revisions. D. Girard recommended removing the reverence to the County's Grading Ordinance and keep the policy language general. <u>Straw vote</u> <b>Unanimous support of the policy revision as recommended by Director Girard.</b>		
A	B	<b>C-P20. Best Practices for County Road Maintenance.</b> Continue use of the Five County Water Quality and Stream Habitat Protection Manual for County Road Maintenance or a functional equivalent, as amended and approved by state and federal resource agencies, for County road maintenance and maintenance yards to minimize impacts to watersheds from roads and maintenance yard facilities.	IM9 	<b>R Vote 7-0</b>
		<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10: All support as written.</b>		




Plan Alternative		Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	<b>C-P21. State and Federal Consistency.</b> Road construction and maintenance activities performed by the County or under the County's land use jurisdiction shall be consistent with and support approved state and federal salmon or steelhead recovery plans, Clean Water Act Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) and the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Stormwater Program.	Prog 	<b>R</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>7-0</b>
		<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>All support as written.</b>		
		<b>D 4231.1.</b> Humboldt County supports the construction of a depressed freeway Route 101 through Eureka. If continued development along the proposed route renders it physically or economically infeasible, Humboldt County would support construction along an alternate route.		<b>D</b>
		<b>D 4231.2.</b> Humboldt County supports improvements and maintenance of public access roads to natural resource areas designated for timber production, agriculture and mining.		<b>D</b>
		<b>D 4231.3.</b> Significant increases in traffic volumes and turning movements on and off a major expressway/freeway at high volume at grade intersections should be discouraged.		<b>D</b>
		<b>D 4231.4.</b> Humboldt County supports the need for additional State revenue from sources such as State Gas Tax for the maintenance and reconstruction of County roads that carry heavy commercial truck traffic.		<b>D</b>
		<b>D 4231.5.</b> Humboldt County shall take action to support the increase of gas tax revenues to a level adequate for local street and road maintenance.		<b>D</b>
		<b>D 4231.6.</b> Humboldt County recognizes that the era of abundant and inexpensive energy has ended. Energy considerations must become a critical element in all policy decisions involving the selection and use of transportation systems.		<b>D</b>
		<b>D 4231.7.</b> The County Planning Commission shall review all proposed abandonments of maintenance on County roads for conformance with the County General Plan before they are approved.		<b>D</b>
		<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>C. Nelson requested that this policy (4231.7) be retained in order for the Commission to</b>		<b>D</b>


Plan Alternative		Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
		review proposed road abandonment. Bob Bronkall (Public Works) stated that there is state law that sets the procedures for street abandonment and that this policy is unnecessary. The Commission then agreed to omit it.		
		<b>Public Transportation</b>		
A	B	<b>C-P22. Public Transit.</b> The County shall support the guiding goals, policies, and objectives of the Public Transit and Paratransit Service Element of the Regional Transportation Plan as amended.	S7, IM12 	R Vote 7-0
		<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> All support as written.		
A	B	<b>C-P23. Public Transit Service.</b> Public transportation systems in the County <del>should</del> shall be coordinated and integrated so that a full range of travel patterns and connectivity with other modes of transportation can be supported. A. Existing and future public transit services should be coordinated so that service from rural areas is effectively integrated with urban service. Schedules should be designed for a smooth transfer between rural and urban buses. Fares should be integrated so that a person pays only once for the full trip. Convenience facilities should be made available so that transfer areas are attractive, well-lit, protected from the weather and <del>have</del> bus information <del>posted</del> is provided. B. Automobile and bicycle transport should be integrated with public transit by developing adequate parking facilities at major bus stops and, where feasible, transporting bicycles on <del>the buses along the</del> intercity <del>and regional</del> buses routes. C. Multi-family housing, public uses such as libraries, schools and community centers, and commercial uses <del>should be encouraged or located</del> in areas serviced by <del>or planned for</del> public transit <del>or subject to impact fees</del> . D. Public transportation should support access to social services and mitigate the impacts of service changes to social service clients. E. Public transportation should provide access to recreation areas. <del>F. Public transportation should expand the bicycle capacity of commuter lines</del>	S7, IM7, IM11 	M Vote 3-3-1












Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><del>and provide front or back loading racks and space for bikes on all regional buses to extend the range and convenience of both transit and bicycle modes.</del></p> <p><del>G. Sidewalks near transit stops should be contiguous, attractive and well lit to encourage walking to and from transit.</del></p> <p><del>H. Transit fares should be maintained at a level that promotes consistently high patronage and encourages more off peak use.</del></p> <p><del>I. The County shall encourage and support improvements such as Bus Rapid Transit strategies where a high level of transit ridership or potential ridership exists and/or where solutions to motor vehicle traffic congestion are needed.</del></p> <p><del>J. The County should encourage the use of adaptive management strategies which will collect, analyze, and iteratively shape public transportation planning to optimize connectivity and access for all user groups.</del></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b></p> <p>There was concern by the Commissioners that the proposed policy language added by the Complete Streets Working Group (Subsections F-J) is too prescriptive and should be eliminated. Director Girard stated that the language in Subsections F-I is already contained in the Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <p><b>The Commissioners all supported the revisions by staff of the CSWG language (as noted in green), and the additional subsections as follows:</b></p> <p><b>Straw vote</b></p> <p><b>Commissioners Smith, Emad and Nelson supported staff's recommendation down to subsection E and supported removing everything after E.</b></p> <p><b>Commissioners Krebs, Gearheart and Faust supported staff's recommendation for subsection C, and the CSWG for the rest except for H, which they supported be removed.</b></p> <p><b>Commissioner Mayo supported staff's recommended language but was still in question of subsection C. 3/3/1</b></p>		




Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<b>D</b>	<p><b>4237. 4.</b> Transportation systems in Humboldt County and those which link the County with other areas of the State are to be coordinated and integrated so that a full range of travel patterns can be supported.</p> <p>A. Existing and future public transit services are to be coordinated so that service from rural areas is effectively integrated with urban service. Schedules should be designed for a smooth transfer between rural and urban buses. Fares should be integrated so that a person pays only once for the full trip. Convenience facilities should be made available so that transfer areas are protected from the weather and bus information is provided.</p> <p>B. Automobile and bicycle transport are to be integrated with public transit by developing adequate parking facilities at major bus stops and, where feasible, transporting bicycles on the buses along the intercity bus routes.</p> <p>C. Multi-family housing shall be encouraged in areas serviced by public transit where consistent with other sections of the plan.</p>		<b>D</b>
<b>A</b>				<p><b>C-Pxx. Long Term Transit Plan.</b> The County shall <b>encourage the development of</b> a long term transit plan with the goal of increasing the percentage of public transit trips compared to automobile trips. <u>The Long Term Transit Plan should be coordinated with the Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plan.</u></p>		<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>All support the CSWG revisions as modified by staff.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>				<p><b>C-Pxxx. Long Term Transit Plan</b> The County shall <b>encourage the development of</b> transit hubs with <del>off-street parking, comfortable</del>-waiting areas protected from weather, covered and secure bike parking in areas which allow the co-location of commercial facilities, and in close proximity to housing for seniors, <u>low-income</u> and disabled persons.</p>		<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>All support the CSWG revisions as modified by staff.</b></p>		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>C-Pxxxx. Investment in Public Transportation.</b> The County shall utilize Transportation Development Act funds for public transit operations and improvements on active transportation facilities.		R Vote 7-0
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> All support new policy language provided by CSWG.		
				<b>Bicycle and Pedestrian Travel</b>		
A	B			<b>C-P24. Investment in Improvements.</b> The County's Capital Improvement Plan shall include an assessment of the needs of bicycles and pedestrians and allocate funds consistent with the goal of increasing the safety, functional <u>network and facility</u> efficiency, and capacity of pedestrian and bike routes. The level of service and quality of service for pedestrians and bicycles shall <b>not</b> be <b>diminished increased, and where practical, shall be increased</b> , when expanding roadway capacity for motorized circulation. Road resurfacing projects should provide improved access and safety for bicycles.	Prog, S7, S9, IM5, IM12 	M Vote 7-0
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> All support the CSWG revisions as modified by staff.		
A	B			<b>C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards.</b> Use objective Multimodal Level of Service <u>and Quality of Service</u> Standards; for example, the Florida Department of Transportation's "Quality/Level of Service Handbook" (FDOT, 2002) or the Transportation Research Board's "Highway Capacity Manual" (TRB, 2000) to assess and plan the multi-modal <u>quality and</u> capacity of county roads and intersections. Analyze neighborhood level conditions using objective methods and criteria such as "walkability audits" <u>and "bikeability audits"</u> .	QJ, Min, S7, IM12  	M Vote 7-0
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> All support new policy language provided by CSWG.		
A	B			<del><b>C-P26. Bicycles and Pedestrian Facilities in New Subdivisions.</b> Off street bike and</del>	QJ, S7, S9, IM12	M

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><del>pedestrian ways facilities or, at a minimum, sidewalks separate set back from roadways shall be required of new major subdivisions. The County shall provide incentives for design and investments in bicycle and pedestrian access beyond regulatory requirements. Bicycle and Pedestrian infrastructure shall be developed in coordination with planned or existing infrastructure to provide a multi-modal network connecting significant destinations.</del></p> <p><b>Proposed by staff on 12-16-10 (C. Faust was excused):</b>  <b>C-P26. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities in New Subdivisions.</b> Sidewalks: In urban areas, sidewalks should be provided. When feasible sidewalks should be separated from the road with a landscape strip. When feasible, sidewalks or trails (Class 1) should be provided to connect neighborhoods.                      Bike lanes: In urban areas, bike lanes (Class 2) should be provided on all collector and arterial roads. In rural areas, bike lanes (Class 2) or bike routes (Class 3) should be provided when demand warrants separated facilities.</p>		<p><b>Vote</b> 6-0</p>
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b>                      Chair Smith questioned whether Public Works staff was okay with this language. Bob Bronkall (of Public Works) stated that the Department is concerned about creating sidewalks in areas where it is not appropriate (gave the Tooby Ranch as an example) – recommends that “shall” be changed to “should”.  <b>C. Smith requests that staff return with new language that addresses this issue.</b></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10:</b>                      Planning Staff consulted with Public Works staff, and determined there were numerous examples where requiring separated bike paths or sidewalks would not be appropriate or necessary.  <u>Straw vote</u>  <b>Unanimous support of the revised policy language provided by staff.</b></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11:</b>                      During the 1-13-11 meeting, Commissioner Faust (who was absent at the 12-9-10 meeting) stated that he did not believe it was necessary to include both the word “feasible” and “should” in the same language and requested that it be re-written to return to “shall”. There was not support by the other Commissioners to do so.</p>		
<p><b>B</b></p>	<p><del><b>C-P27 Right-of-Way Design Standards.</b> Right-of-way design standards should</del></p>	<p>Leg, S1, S7, IM1</p>	<p><b>D –</b></p>


Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<del>incorporate specifications for bicycles, pedestrians, public transit facilities, and buffers.</del>		see Alt A policy
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> Chair Smith asked if Public Works was okay with the language regarding urban standards. Bob Bronkall replied that there is a table in the back of the chapter with standards that also references growth rates.</p> <p><u>Straw vote</u> <b>Unanimous support with the wording in Alternative A language with “buffers” left in.</b></p>		
A				<b>C-P27 Right-of-Way Design Standards.</b> Right-of-way design standards <del>should</del> <u>shall</u> incorporate specifications for bicycles, pedestrians, <del>and</del> public transit facilities, <b>and buffers.</b>	See <u>underline</u> and <del>strike through</del> text for differences with Alternative B.	M Vote 7-0
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> See discussion above.</p>		
A	B			<b>C-P28. Landscape Buffer Strips.</b> Landscape buffer strips shall be used, where feasible, to segregate pedestrian walkways from arterial and collector roadways.	QJ, Min 	R Vote 7-0
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> All support as written.</p>		
A	B			<b>C-P29. Removal of Obstacles in Pathways.</b> <b>Where feasible,</b> new pathways and sidewalks shall be free of obstacles such as utility poles and mailboxes. Where obstacles are unavoidable on existing sidewalks or pathways, they shall be widened or otherwise designed to provide the least amount of obstruction to users. <del>Fences shall be set back and driveway aprons shall have no side slope.</del>	QJ, Min, S8, IM1 	M Vote 7-0
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10</b> <b>Commissioner Gearheart was concerned with the mandatory nature of the wording for this policy and Director Girard suggested that “where feasible” be added at the beginning of the sentence and strike the last sentence.</b></p>		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>All support the recommendations by Director Girard.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-P30. On-Street Parking.</b> Design on-street parking <del>in commercial areas</del> to minimize conflicts with <del>bicycles and pedestrians</del> <u>planned bicycle routes</u> . <b>Where appropriate</b> , creative on-street parking arrangements such as parking pockets or bays shall be considered to improve design flexibility.	QJ, Min  	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10</b> <b>Commissioner Emad recommended that we take out “commercial areas” in the first sentence and add “where appropriate” at the beginning of the second sentence.</b> <b>All support the recommendations by C. Emad.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-P31. Design Standards for All Pathways.</b> Published design standards, such as the Caltrans Highway Design Manual, <u>the San Francisco Bicycle Plan Supplemental Design Guidelines (2005)</u> , <u>VTA’s Bicycle Technical Guidelines (1999)</u> and <u>VTA’s Pedestrian Technical Guidelines (2003)</u> , or equivalent, shall be used by the County Public Works Department for the design and construction of pedestrian and bicycle <del>paths</del> <u>facilities</u> . All new hard surfaced walkways shall be wheelchair accessible. Existing hard surfaced walkways should be improved to be wheelchair accessible when funding is available or when development projects occur on adjacent parcels.	Leg, S8, IM1  	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>All support new policy language provided by CSWG.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-P32. Traffic Calming.</b> Use traffic calming measures, where appropriate, as a means of <del>providing safe</del> <u>improving safety for</u> pedestrians and bicycles <del>access</del> . Traffic calming measures include, but are not limited to, roundabouts, chicanes, curb extensions, and traffic circles.	QJ, Min  	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>All support new policy language provided by CSWG.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-P33. Protection of Designated Pedestrian and Bicycle Routes.</b> The County shall review land development along and adjacent to designated pedestrian and bicycle routes to ensure that adjacent new development is consistent with established right-of-	QJ, Min, S1-2, S8-9, IM1, IM12	<b>R Vote 7-0</b>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				ways and compatible with the safety and capacity of the corridor.		
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>All support as written.</b>		
	<b>B</b>			<b>C-P34. Encourage Bicycle Facilities. Strongly</b> encourage the placement of secure, weather-protected bicycle storage facilities at bus stops, businesses, and public buildings. Encourage the addition of bicycle transport racks on public buses.	QJ, Min, S8, IM12 	<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>4-3</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-9-10:</b> <b>Commissioners Smith, Mayo, Emad and Nelson support B Version with the addition of “strongly” encourage at the beginning of the sentence.</b> <b>Commissioner Faust, Kreb and Gearheart support the Alternative A policy language.</b> <b>Commissioner Emad would support A with some modification.</b>		
	<b>A</b>			<b>C-P34. Bicycle Facilities.</b> <u>Require the installation of bicycle racks or storage facilities for multi-family residential, commercial and industrial development.</u> Encourage the placement of secure, weather-protected bicycle storage facilities at bus stops, <del>businesses,</del> and public buildings. Encourage the addition of bicycle transport racks on public buses.	See <u>underline</u> and <del>strikethrough</del> text for differences with Alternative B.	<b>D</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: see comments for Alternative B.</b>		
	<b>B</b>			<b>C-P35. Development of Railroad Right-of-Ways for Bicycles and Pedestrians.</b> Encourage development of the <del>Northwestern Pacific (NWP) and</del> Annie and Mary Railroad rights-of-way as Class 1 bikeway (bike and pedestrian path) provided those uses do not conflict with regional rail transportation system plans. <b>The County shall work to preserve railroad rights-of-way as a contiguous public use transportation corridor.</b>	IM12 	<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>4-2-1</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10 (C. Faust was excused):</b> During the public comment period, Karen Deimer with the City of Arcata, submitted the following policy language (C. Gearheart requested that this policy language be read into the record): <b>'...support all methods of corridor preservation including railbanking to ensure</b>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p>continued public use.'</p> <p><b>Straw vote for C-P35</b></p> <p><b>Commissioners Gearheart and Krebs were in support of Alternative B with the inclusion of the recommended language by Ms. Karen Diemer.</b></p> <p><b>Commissioners Smith, Emad, Nelson and Mayo were in support of staff's original policy language with the exclusion of the words 'North West Pacific'.</b></p> <p><b>The Commissioners were all in support of the suggestion by Commissioner Krebs to see language that prevented the railroad right of way being broken into pieces and preserved it as a whole.</b></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b></p> <p>Commissioner Faust was not in attendance during the 12-16 meeting and wished to submit his comments for the record and vote on this policy.</p> <p>He stated that in fact, the NCRA is a state agency. He is a strong believer in rail and marine traffic for goods movement. Automobiles are subsidized however. NCRA has rights to railroad and can only be "forced" by legislature, NCRA must agree. ROW remains theirs. There is testimony that there is a rail line, but it does not exist, the ROW does exist. To rehabilitate the railway is major project. Substantial planning/study effort is required. Does not see it happening with NCRA. Marine transport is more likely feasible than rail. Given that, what are we risking by saying that we are in favor of rail banking? Massive support for trail between Eureka and Arcata. Does not favor deletion of "NWP and" and not aware of railway system plan. Thinks that NWP should be put back in and thinks that system a plan should be prepared and include feasibility.</p> <p><b>1-13-11</b></p> <p><b>Commissioner Faust Supports A Alternative.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<p><b>C-P35. Development of Railroad Right-of-Ways for Bicycles and Pedestrians.</b></p> <p>Support the <del>re</del>banking of <u>appropriate railroad right-of-ways including</u> the Northwestern Pacific (NWP) and Annie and Mary Railroad rights-of-way and the development of a Class 1 bikeway (bike and pedestrian path) within the existing rail alignment. Include provisions for decommissioning and relocation of the bikeway if demand and resources supports resumption of rail-service.</p>		<b>D</b>



Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>COMMENTS:</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-P36. Develop a Regional Trails System.</b> Support efforts to establish and connect a regional trails system extending from <del>Trinidad Orick</del> to Garberville and east <del>to</del> <u>connecting</u> Willow Creek and the Hoopa Valley <u>areas.</u> <del>with linkages to</del> <u>The System should include</u> the California Coastal Trail system <u>and incorporate multi-use trails where feasible.</u>	Prog 	<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>6-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10</b> <b>All support new policy language provided by CSWG.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<b>C-P37. Encourage Equestrian <del>Horse</del> Trails.</b> Encourage the development of equestrian recreation trails <u>and a multi-use trail system that supports equestrian use where appropriate.</u>	Prog, S10	<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>6-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS:</b> <b>All support new policy language provided by CSWG with the removal of the word "horse" in the title.</b>		
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 1.</b> Develop an accessible trails network as shown on trails map which includes trails within and between communities, parks and other publicly owned lands.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 2.</b> Provide safe bicycle and pedestrian trails to schools, when it is determined that inadequate access exists.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 3.</b> Encourage development of trails with varying lengths and difficulty through diverse terrain, scenery, and points of attraction.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 4.</b> Blend trails into the natural environment to reduce environmental disruption.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 5.</b> Place priority of bicycle route maintenance on routes that are most heavily used.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 6.</b> Encourage the provision of secure, weather protected bicycle storage facilities at bus stops, businesses, and public buildings as needed.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 7.</b> Encourage appropriate buses to be equipped with bicycle transport racks.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>4311. 8.</b> Encourage development of access and, where suitable, camping areas into existing and future recreation areas.		<b>D</b>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			D	<b>4311. 9.</b> Encourage the placement of landscaping along horsetrails located adjacent to roadways to serve as safety and/or visual screens between trail and vehicle lanes.		D
				<b>Marine Transportation</b>		
A	B	C		<b>C-P38. Channel Maintenance.</b> Support continued maintenance of harbor channels to provide deep water access to existing and planned port facilities.	Prog	
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10:</b> All support as written.		
A	B	C		<b>C-P39. Commercial Fishing Facilities.</b> Support the improvement and modernization of facilities that provide support and access to markets for the commercial fishing industry.	Prog	R Vote 6-0
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10:</b> All support as written.		
A	B	C		<b>C-P40. Public Infrastructure Supporting Private Investment.</b> Support investments in public infrastructure that increase readiness and facilitate private initiatives and investment into port enterprises such as marine-dependent industrial use, boat building and repair facilities, fleet service facilities, tourism, recreation, and fish processing facilities.	Prog	R Vote 6-0
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10:</b> All support as written.		
A	B	C		<b>C-P41. Movement of Goods.</b> Encourage marine transport options, such as coastal barge service, <del>to reduce truck transportation on Highways 101 and 299.</del>	Prog	M Vote 6-0
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10:</b> Chair Smith requested that the last part of the sentence be deleted. <u>Straw vote</u> Unanimous support of staff’s recommendation with the removal of the words ‘to reduce truck transportation on Highways 101 and 299.’		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			D	<b>4232.1.</b> The deepening of the ship channels in Humboldt Bay beyond a depth of 35 feet may be justified. Humboldt County supports continued maintenance of the channels to provide access to existing and planned port facilities.		D
			D	<b>4232. 2.</b> Humboldt County supports the improvement and modernization of commercial fishing facilities in Humboldt County. The cities of Eureka and Trinidad, Humboldt County and Humboldt Bay Harbor District should actively and cooperatively seek to encourage private investment into commercial facilities and, where necessary, invest public funds into rehabilitation, upgrading and expanding boat marinas and public piers.		D
			D	<b>4232. 3.</b> Several public agencies are responsible for the improvement of waterfront facilities on Humboldt Bay. Their efforts should be coordinated so that the public investment is effectively applied to support the commercial fishing industry and other public uses. The Humboldt Bay Harbor Recreation and Conservation District should take the lead role in coordinating this development.		D
			D	<b>4232. 4.</b> Local business groups should be encouraged to work with local government to encourage private investment into facilities such as: Boat building and repair facilities; Fleet service facilities; and Fish processing facilities.		D
				<b>Rail Transportation</b>		
A	B	C		<b>C-P42. Re-establishing Regional Rail Service.</b> <del>Public investment to re-establish regional rail service should be contingent on a private or public demand for sustained rail service and an analysis of net benefits to the County's economy, transportation systems, and environment.</del> <b>Support and encourage rail service in and out of the county and connected to other parts of the state.</b>	Prog	M Vote 4-3
				<b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10</b> <b>Commissioner Gearheart and Kreb were in support of staff's recommendation.</b> <b>Commissioners Emad, Nelson, Smith and Mayo supported revising the policy to read: 'support and encourage rail service in and out of the county and other parts of the state.'</b>		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>C. Foust is in support of staff's recommendation along with C. Krebs and Gearhart.</b></p> <p><b>Chair Smith recalled a discussion that the policy should be re-written to relate to interconnection within the County and other parts of the state. He recommended adding the words "connected to" before "other parts of the state."</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<p><b>C-P43. Rail Right-of-Way.</b> Protect and reserve the rail right-of-way for public and private transportation uses.</p>	QJ, Min, Prog	<b>R</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10:</b>  <b>All support as written.</b></p>		
			<b>D</b>	<p><b>4233.1.</b> The railroad system connecting to points south shall be maintained and operated to support the County's economic development and maintain the diversification of the County circulation network.</p>		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<p><b>4233. 2.</b> The County supports the modernization of freight rail services.</p>		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<p><b>4233. 3.</b> Humboldt County supports efforts to have the Northwestern Pacific Rail Line included in the California State Rail Plan as a project designated eligible to receive Federal funds for rehabilitation and new facility construction.</p>		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<p><b>4233. 4.</b> Humboldt County supports State and Federal programs that would provide funding for railroad crossing protection devices</p>		<b>D</b>
				<p><b>Air Transportation</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>		<p><b>C-P44. Expansion of Airline Service.</b> The County shall work to sustain and expand commercial passenger airline <u>and freight</u> service to and from the County consistent with the <del>Arcata-Eureka</del> Airport Master Plan and the economic development goals of the County.</p>	Prog	<b>M Vote 6-0</b>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10</b>                      Commissioner Gearheart was concerned that freight service was not addressed in this policy and requested that it be add in after "airline". Public Works staff requested that we eliminate all the airports names and reference the airport master plan instead.</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>Straw vote</b>  <b>Unanimous support of the revised policy language provided by C. Gearheart and staff.</b></p>		
	<p><b>C-P45 Commercial Areas.</b> Commercial projects <del>shall</del> should be <del>be planned and</del> encouraged to <del>developed</del> <del>inner to inter-</del> inter-connecting traffic features <del>parking lots</del> with other commercial projects <del>properties to facilitate access to traffic signals.</del></p>	New Policy submitted by Public Works	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Vote</b>  <b>6-0</b></p>
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10</b>                      Chair Smith requested the following revision: "Commercial projects should be encouraged to develop inter-connecting traffic features with other commercial projects."  <b>Straw vote</b>  <b>Unanimous support of the revised language suggested by Chairman Smith. The Commission also directed that policies C-P45, C-P47, and C-P48 be moved to the appropriate sections and be re-numbered.</b></p>		
	<p><b>C-P47. Frontage Improvements.</b> As properties are developed, all road frontages of the property shall be improved to the appropriate standard for the road. Improvements to both sides of the road shall be required when the property on the other side of the road does not have legal rights to use the road. Exceptions may be granted by the Planning Commission.</p>	New Policy submitted by Public Works	<p><b>M</b>  <b>Vote</b>  <b>6-0</b></p>
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 12-16-10:</b>                      (Commission recommended that these new policies submitted by Public Works would need to be re-numbered and relocated).  <b>Unanimous support of proposed policy by Public Works.</b></p>		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11:</b>                      Commissioner Faust did not understand C-P47 and in what instances it would apply. Bob Bronkall showed a slide and answered the question stating that the policy relates to private roads serving a subdivision. C. Faust asked why the County would allow this circumstance to occur. Planning is supposed to avoid this situation. Faust would encourage Planning and Public Works to get together on this and re-write.</p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><del>C-P48. Construction and Maintenance. No policy, goal, or standard in the general plan is intended to prevent the construction of general plan circulation routes to appropriate design standards. No policy, goal, or standard in the general plan is intended to prevent the widening, improvement, maintenance of any County maintained facility.</del> (policy suggested by Department of Public Works)</p>	<p>New Policy submitted by Public Works</p>	<p><b>D</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>5-1-1</b></p>
	<p><b>Comments: 12-16-10</b>                      Planning Staff tom Hofweber explained that staff was not in support of the proposed policy due to the horizontal and vertical consistency of county and state regulations. He explained it went against the framework of what a General Plan was supposed to do.  <b>County Counsel Carolyn Ruth</b> suggested the Commission not weigh in and let County staff work together and come back with a revised proposed policy.</p>		
	<p><b>Comments: 1-13-11</b>                      Staff returned with the following revised language:  <u>C-P48. Construction and Maintenance of General Plan Circulation Routes. General plan circulation routes are intended to provide essential connectivity and circulation and are a priority land use. Construction and maintenance of such routes shall adhere to other general plan policies and standards to the extent practical. Prescriptive standards that may otherwise prevent the construction and maintenance of these routes to appropriate design standards may be adjusted to accommodate the route provided the best feasible mitigation is applied.</u></p> <p>C. Faust objected saying that changes don't go far enough and will in effect throw out other policies of the GPU. The GP should not do this, all policies should be considered. Building roads should not sacrifice the other objectives of the GP. We need to rethink what we want to do. Faust sees a significant difference between construction and maintenance in this regard. Deputy County Counsel Carolyn Ruth reminded the Planning Commission that the Planning staff did not want C-P48 at all and including this policy is the prerogative of the Planning Commission.</p> <p><u>Straw vote</u>  <b>Chairman Smith supported staffs originally recommended language.</b></p>		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>Commissioners Kreb, Gearheart, Faust, Nelson, and Emad supported the elimination of C-P48.</b>  <b>Commissioner Mayo supported staff revising the policy and bringing it back. 1/5/1</b></p>		
	<p><del>C-P49. Bus Turnouts. Bus turnouts shall be constructed at the far side of the intersection on all Arterial/Arterial intersections; all Major Collector/Arterial intersections; and on the arterial leg of Minor Collector/Arterial intersections. Bus turnouts shall be constructed based upon the ultimate typical section for the road and constructed in a manner that will place the bus entirely out of the travel lands. Additional right of way may be required for the turnouts including areas for sidewalks and bus shelters. Exceptions may be granted by the Planning Commission. See the diagram below. (from Department of Public Works)</del></p>	<p>New policy suggested by DPW</p>	<p><b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>7-0</b></p>
	<p><b>Comments: 1-13-11</b>                      Planning Commission requested that staff re-write for simplicity.</p>		
	<p><b>Comments: 1-20-11</b>                      The proposed revisions for C-P49 include:  <del>C-P49. Bus Turnouts. Bus turnouts are preferred over in-lane bus stops. Projects constructing curbs on Collector and Arterial roads shall be coordinated with the local transit authority to determine if bus turnouts are warranted to meet the current and future needs of the transit authority. Additional right of way may be required for the turnouts including areas for sidewalks and bus shelters.</del>  <b>C-P49 Straw vote</b>  <b>Unanimous support of revised language</b></p>		
	<p><b>D 4234. 1.</b> Humboldt County should regularly update and maintain the Airport Master Plan as the primary County policy document for airport development.</p>		<p><b>D</b></p>
	<p><b>D 4234. 2.</b> Humboldt County shall establish land use controls around airports as recommended by the Airports Master Plan through the Airport Land Use Commission.</p>		<p><b>D</b></p>
	<p><b>D 4234. 3.</b> Humboldt County supports efforts to expand commercial airline service to the area.</p>		<p><b>D</b></p>

Plan Alternative			Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
			<b>7.5 Standards</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<p><b>C-S1. Functional Classifications.</b> Roadway functional classifications and standards are shown below in Table 7-B (pages xxx and xxx), and further specified in Title III—Land Use and Development Division 2 Subdivision Regulations.                      Note: Correct page numbers will appear in final version.</p>		<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>All support as modified by staff.</b></p>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<p><b>C-S2. Neighborhood Connectivity.</b> <u>Local roads shall be planned to allow for orderly development of the community.</u> Standards for neighborhood connectivity shall be those specified in Title III—Land Use and Development Division 2 Subdivision Regulations. Connectivity standards shall govern:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Intersection spacing</li> <li>B. Block sizes</li> <li>C. Cul-de-sacs and dead-end roads</li> <li>D. Secondary access requirements</li> <li>E. Gated communities and other restricted access roads</li> <li>F. Access connections between local, connector and arterial roads</li> <li>G. Pedestrian and cycling connections</li> <li>H. Construction and connection of street “stubs,” to adjacent parcels</li> </ul> <p><u>The Department of Public Works shall approve all road alignments.</u></p>		<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>Bob Bronkall</b> suggested that since the DPW's proposed C-S11 is similar to S2, these standards should be merged.                      The commission recommended that staff return with revised wording that would merge S11 into S2.</p>		
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-20-11</b>  <b>Unanimous support of revised language – merging S11 into S2.</b></p>		



Plan Alternative			Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<p><b>C-S3. Traffic Thresholds of Significance.</b> Apply objective measures, such as roadway capacity and <u>multimodal</u> quality/level of service from the Transportation Research Board Highway Capacity Manual or its equivalent, <u>such as Health Impact Assessments</u> to make determinations on the significance of traffic impacts for CEQA purposes.</p>		M Vote 4-3
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>Commissioners Kreb, Faust, Gearheart and Emad support the CSWG revisions as modified by staff.</b>  <b>Commissioners Smith, Mayo and Nelson supported staff’s original language.</b></p>		
A	B		<p><b>C-S4. Pavement Management Criteria.</b> Strive to maintain the overall condition of County-maintained roadways above the 50<sup>th</sup> percentile of the Overall Condition Index (OCI) and Modified OCI developed in the 2008 Technical Report.</p>		R Vote 7-0
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>All support as written by staff.</b></p>		
	B	C	<p><b>C-S5. Prioritizing <u>Roadway Transportation</u> Capital Expenditures.</b> Objective criteria shall be used to prioritize <u>roadway transportation</u> capital expenditures. Criteria shall be developed to reflect consideration of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Accident data and <u>multi-modal</u> traffic engineering safety analysis for safety projects.</li> <li>B. <u>Multi-modal</u> LOS and Quality of Service (QOS) measures for congestion relief projects.</li> <li>C. Analysis of future development potential based on the Housing Element land inventory for growth accommodating projects.</li> <li>D. Reductions in roadway system maintenance costs.</li> <li>E. Community demand and public interest.</li> <li>F. <u>Transportation Demand Management Plan</u></li> </ul>		M Vote 7-0
			<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>Unanimous support of the CSWG revision with the change of “roadway” to “transportation” and the elimination of (F).</b></p>		

Plan Alternative			Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B	C	<b>C-S6. Prioritizing Road Maintenance Projects.</b> Use and refine the OCI rating system to prioritize road maintenance projects for roads that have been assessed under this system.		<b>R</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>7-0</b>
			<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>All support as written by staff.</b>		
A	B		<b>C-S7. Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian <u>Quality/Level of Service Standards</u>.</b> Bicycle and pedestrian <u>Quality/Level of Service Standards</u> shall be specified in <u>county code Title III—Land Use and Development Division 2 Subdivision Regulations</u> . For land use planning purposes, the County shall reference Transit Level of Service standards specified in the Public Transit Service Element of the Regional Transportation Plan as amended.		<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>7-0</b>
			<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>Unanimous support of the CSWG revision with the change of “county code” in place of “Title III-Land Use and Development Division 2 Subdivision Regulations.”</b>		
A	B		<b>C-S8. Pedestrian and Bicycle System.</b> A Board adopted Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plan consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan shall identify trails and routes considered a part of County maintained circulation system. Development projects proposed on lands that include a County maintained trail or route may be required to dedicate easements or make improvements if an individualized determination is made that the dedication is related both in nature and extent and is roughly proportional to the impact of the proposed development consistent with standards specified in Title III—Land Use and Development Division 2 Subdivision Regulations. <u>The Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plan should be coordinated with a Long-term Transit Plan.</u>		<b>M</b> <b>Vote</b> <b>6-1</b>
			<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>Commissioners Smith supported the original staff language with the last sentence removed.</b> <b>Commissioners Kreb, Emad, Gearheart, Nelson and Mayo supported the CSWG revision.</b>		
A	B	C	<b>C-S9. Prioritization of Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities and Routes.</b> Objective		<b>M</b>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p>criteria shall be used to prioritize construction of pedestrian and bicycle facilities and routes. Criteria shall be developed to reflect consideration of:</p> <p>A. Providing safe and continuous connections between:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Neighborhoods and public schools</li> <li>2) Residential areas and workplaces, <u>shopping districts, daily retail and social services</u></li> <li>3) Transit stops and public facilities</li> <li>4) Adjacent open spaces or recreation areas</li> </ol> <p>B. Reductions in vehicle miles traveled</p> <p>C. Community demand and public interest</p> <p>D. <u>Transportation Demand Management Plan</u></p>		Vote 5-2
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b></p> <p><b>Commissioners Faust, Emad, Gearheart, Smith, and Kreb supports as modified with elimination of “D”.</b></p> <p><b>Commissioners Nelson and Mayo are in favor of the Humboldt Association of Realtor’s language to add new D and E.</b></p> <p><b>Chair Smith stated that realtors likely want a prioritization of the road repair and asked Bronkall if he wanted to bring back recommendation on prioritization policy for consideration by the Commission.</b></p>		
A	B			<p><b>C-S10. Equestrian Horse Trails.</b> Use the Federal Highway Administration, “Equestrian Design Guidebook for Trails,” or its equivalent, as a guide for the analysis and design of equestrian trails.</p>		M Vote 7-0
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b></p> <p><b>Unanimous support as written with the removal of the word “Horse” from the title.</b></p>		
				<p><del><b>C-S11. Local Roads.</b> Local roads are typically not shown on circulation maps and typically planned at the time development is proposed. Local roads shall be planned to allow for orderly development of the community; to create parallel routes; to interconnect with adjacent roads and provide short blocks; and to provide stub-outs that will allow for the orderly development of adjacent properties. The Public Works</del></p>		D

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<del>Department shall approve all road alignments.</del> (from Department of Public Works)		
	<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>Unanimous Support for staff to merge C-S11 and C-S2 and bring it back to the Commission at a future date. See revisions to C-S2.</b></p>		
D	<p><b>4240. 1.</b> The Rural Principal Arterial system consists of a connected rural network of continuous routes which have trip length and travel density characteristics indicative of substantial statewide or interstate travel.</p>		D
D	<p><b>4240. 2.</b> The Rural Minor Arterial road system, in conjunction with the rural principal arterial system, links cities and towns above 5,000 in population and other major traffic generators, and forms an integrated network providing interstate and intercounty service.</p>		D
D	<p><b>4240. 3.</b> Rural Connectors provide connections between the higher order system and have low-volume/long trip length characteristics.</p>		D
D	<p><b>4240. 4.</b> The Rural Collector routes generally serve travel or primarily regional importance rather than statewide importance and constitute those routes on which (regardless of traffic volume) predominant travel distances are shorter than on arterial routes. The collector road system is subclassified into two categories:                      a. Major Collectors are spaced at intervals, consistent with population density, to collect traffic from local roads and bring all developed areas within a reasonable distance of a collector road.                      b. Minor Collectors are spaced at intervals, consistent with population density, to collect traffic from local roads and bring all developed areas within a reasonable distance of a collector road.</p>		D
D	<p><b>4240. 5.</b> The Rural Local Road system serves primarily to provide access to adjacent land and accommodate travel over relatively short distances as compared to higher systems. (Not shown individually on circulation map.)</p>		D
D	<p><b>4240. 6.</b> Urban Principal Arterials in conjunction with Rural Principal Arterials, provide the highest level of conventional street service to virtually all area traffic generators.</p>		D
D	<p><b>4240. 8.</b> Road Classification - Minimum Corridor Standards (Appendix 4-1 of the County</p>		D

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D																		
	Subdivision Ordinance).  <p style="text-align: center;"><b>County Minimum</b></p> <table border="0" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Classification</u></th> <th style="text-align: left;"><u>Roadway Design Category</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rural Principal Arterial</td> <td>State Highway</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural Minor Arterial</td> <td>State Highway</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rural Connector</td> <td>State Highway</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Major Rural Collector</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Minor Rural Collector</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Urban Principal Arterial</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Minor Urban Collector</td> <td>5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Minor Urban Arterial</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Classification</u>	<u>Roadway Design Category</u>	Rural Principal Arterial	State Highway	Rural Minor Arterial	State Highway	Rural Connector	State Highway	Major Rural Collector	5	Minor Rural Collector	4	Urban Principal Arterial	6	Minor Urban Collector	5	Minor Urban Arterial	6		
<u>Classification</u>	<u>Roadway Design Category</u>																				
Rural Principal Arterial	State Highway																				
Rural Minor Arterial	State Highway																				
Rural Connector	State Highway																				
Major Rural Collector	5																				
Minor Rural Collector	4																				
Urban Principal Arterial	6																				
Minor Urban Collector	5																				
Minor Urban Arterial	6																				
D	<b>4312. 1.</b> Capital improvement programs should determine specific project expenses reflective of available finances and volunteer resources.		D																		
D	<b>4312. 2.</b> Maintenance of trails includes, but is not limited to, drainage grate modification, pothole repair, and bicycle path sweeping.		D																		
D	<b>4312. 3.</b> Education and associated law enforcement programs should be used through use of media, brochures, and/or public presentations.		D																		
D	<b>4312. 4.</b> Enforcement of rules pertaining to trails is to be accomplished through contact with the California Highway Patrol, County Sheriff and recognized volunteer trail patrol groups.		D																		
D	<b>4312. 5.</b> Trail system coordination is to be accomplished through contract with cities, Caltrans, and other appropriate agencies.		D																		
D	<b>4312. 6.</b> Notwithstanding policies of Coastal Elements, the following methods may be utilized for trail right of way acquisitions; where trails cross private lands: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Purchase of fee title, option to purchase agreements</li> <li>- Bargain sales (part sale and part charitable contribution)</li> <li>- Outright donation (fee simple)</li> <li>- Donation with a reserved life estate or undivided land interest</li> <li>- Bequests</li> <li>- Donation or purchase of easement</li> </ul>		D																		

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lease and/or sale and leaseback</li> <li>- Various parkland dedication ordinance provisions of the State Subdivision Map Act</li> <li>- Various provisions of the California State Subdivision Map Act as in Articles 3 and 4, Chapter 4, or other relevant provisions</li> <li>- Eminent Domain may be used as a last resort when all other acquisition methods have proved unsuccessful. The County should not use proceedings of eminent domain in the acquisition of property for trail purposes, where those properties are managed primarily for agricultural or timber production, except for purposes of widening County roads.</li> </ul>		
	<p><b>D 4312. 7.</b> In the review of accessways to trails, the approving authority shall find that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. The proposed mode of access and the location of such access shall be consistent with adjacent uses and shall not have an adverse impact on adjacent owners' use of their property and shall be consistent with the intensity of development; and</li> <li>B. The likelihood of trespass and vandalism on adjacent private property has been minimized through the location of, and the level of improvements required, for the use of the accessway; and</li> <li>C. The need to provide for public health and safety has been evaluated for:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. parking</li> <li>2. road capacity and traffic patterns</li> <li>3. conflicts in uses (i.e. pedestrian, equestrian, vehicular)</li> <li>4. use by the handicapped</li> <li>5. capacity of sanitary facilities including trash disposal</li> <li>6. topography of trail (too steep);</li> </ul> </li> <li>D. Adequate access is not available nearby; and</li> <li>E. There is no significant conflict with agriculture including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. vandalism,</li> <li>2. theft of livestock, agricultural supplies and tools,</li> <li>3. damage to crops and livestock,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<b>D</b>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				4. trespass on areas not part of accessway, 5. damage to fencing and gates, 6. livestock depredation, 7. litter, 8. interference with agricultural operations; and F. The development and use of the accessways shall be consistent with the environmental limitations as shown on the Biological Resources Maps.		
				<b>7.6 Implementation Measures</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-IM1. Circulation Standards.</b> <del>R The County shall</del> Review and update roadway, pedestrian, and bicycling facility standards in the Humboldt County Roadway Design Standards Manual, Title III—Land Use and Development Division 2 Subdivision Regulations, and other appropriate ordinances.		<b>R Vote 7-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>Unanimous support of staff original language.</b>		
	<b>B</b>			<b>C-IM2. Tracking Road Improvement Requirements.</b> Public Works shall <del>Public Works shall</del> Develop, maintain, and publish an inventory of road segments and intersections that do not meet LOS or road classification standards given existing traffic levels or number of currently developed parcels.		<b>D- use Alt A</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>See comments under Alternative A</b>		
<b>A</b>				<b>C-IM2. Tracking Road Improvement Requirements.</b> <del>Public Works shall</del> Develop, maintain, and publish an inventory of road segments and intersections that do not meet LOS or road classification standards given existing traffic levels or number of currently developed parcels. <u>The inventory shall also include needed multimodal transportation improvements, including bicycle, pedestrian Class I multi-use paths, using multi-modal quality of service (QOS) measures.</u>	See underline text for differences with Alternative B.	<b>M Vote 7-0</b>

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>Unanimous support of Alternative A with the revisions recommended by Commissioner Faust.</b></p>		
A	B	C		<p><b>C-IM3. Road Abandonment.</b> Proposals to vacate or abandon ownership or maintenance of County roads shall include a General Plan consistency review and analysis.</p>		<p><b>R</b>  <b>Vote</b>  <b>7-0</b></p>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>All support as written by staff.</b></p>		
A	B			<p><b>C-IM4. Regional Coordination.</b> <del>The County shall</del> Support and participate in joint circulation system and land use planning with HCOAG, affected cities, <del>and</del> Caltrans, <del>and other transportation agencies and providers.</del> <del>The County shall</del> Maintain, update, and validate the <del>GEATM</del> Greater Eureka Area Transportation Model or its equivalent on a regular basis, and use the model to evaluate development-related <del>traffic multi-modal transportation</del> impacts on <del>the County and city</del> existing and proposed circulation system.</p>		<p><b>M</b>  <b>Vote</b>  <b>7-0</b></p>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>Unanimous support with the removal of the words “The County shall” from the entire measure and a request to spell out the acronym “GEATM”.</b></p>		
A	B	C		<p><b>C-IM5. Roadway System Construction.</b> Develop funding mechanisms to complete construction of critical segments of the roadway system designated in the Circulation Element and identified in the Capital Improvement Plan. <del>Include bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure funding in all appropriate requests. The highest priority for the use of limited funds should be placed on projects where multi-modal both vehicle and active transportation infrastructure improvements are needed most.</del></p>		<p><b>M</b>  <b>Vote</b>  <b>4-3</b></p>
				<p><b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b>  <b>Commissioners Kreb, Gearheart, Faust, &amp; Emad, supported the wording suggested by the CSWG as revised by staff.</b>  <b>Commissioner Smith, Nelson and Mayo supported staff original language with the addition of the word “Strive” before “Include bicycle and pedestrian...” and the deletion of the last sentence.</b></p>		



Plan Alternative			Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
A	B		<del>C-IM6. Coordination with Public Health.</del> Refer subdivisions creating more than 30 parcels and discretionary permits for commercial developments in excess of 50,000 square feet to the Environmental Health Division for review and comments on potential public health effects.		D Vote 4-3
			<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>Commissioner Smith, Nelson, Emad and Mayo were in support of eliminating IM6. Commissioners Gearheart, Kreb, Faust, were in support of changing “Environmental Health Division” for “Public Health”.</b>		
A	B		<b>C-IM7. Transit Infrastructure.</b> Work with regional transit providers (K-T Net, Blue Lake Rancheria Transit, Humboldt Transit Authority, Arcata & Mad River Transit System and Redwood Coast Transit) to situate transit stops and hubs at locations that are convenient for transit users, and promote increased transit usage through the provision of shelters, benches, and other amenities.		R Vote 7-0
			<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>All support as written.</b>		
A	B	C	<del>C-IM8. Park and Ride Facilities.</del> Support Caltrans' efforts to add park-and-ride lots <del>in McKinleyville, and Fortuna, and other at</del> <b>locations as appropriate.</b>		M Vote 7-0
			<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>All support as revised.</b>		
A	B		<b>C-IM9. Adoption of Water Quality and Stream Habitat Protection Measures.</b> Formally adopt and maintain the Five County, “Water Quality and Stream Habitat Protections Manual for County Road Maintenance” or its equivalent, to guide the following activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. Routine and emergency road repair</li> <li>B. Maintenance of county roads and related facilities, including actions taken to prevent erosion and/or the deterioration of a roadway, such as activities affecting the cutbank, road surface, fillslope, and all drainage structure</li> <li>C. Maintenance and replacement of bridges and culverts</li> </ul>		R Vote 7-0

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				D. Activities on County-owned maintenance yards E. Measures to protect the traveling public, such as snow and ice removal		
				<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>All support as written.</b>		
	<b>B</b>			<del><b>C-IM10. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements.</b> Issuance of Coastal Development Permits and other discretionary permits by the County for the U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvement Project should support a strategy that treats all three main roads between Arcata and Eureka (U.S. Highway 101, State Route 255, and Old Arcata Road/Myrtle Avenue) as one system. The strategy would develop an overall <u>multi-modal</u> improvement plan that phases improvements on a prioritized basis between the three roads.</del>	Staff recommended addition of "multi-modal" to maintain consistency with CP-17.	<b>D – see Alt A</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>See discussion under Alternative A.</b>		
	<b>A</b>			<b>C-IM10. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements.</b> Issuance of Coastal Development Permits and other discretionary permits by the County for the U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvement Project <u>shall</u> support a multimodal strategy that treats all three main roads between Arcata and Eureka (U.S. Highway 101, State Route 255, and Old Arcata Road/Myrtle Avenue) as one system. The strategy would develop an overall multi-modal improvement plan that phases improvements on a prioritized basis between the three roads. <u>The strategy should include an adaptive management element which will collect, analyze, and iteratively shape further safety improvements to the Corridor.</u> Corridor improvements must not create adverse impacts to bicycle and pedestrian use without offsetting mitigations or enhancements consistent with Cal Trans Complete Streets Deputy Directive DD-64-R1 or successor policies.	See <u>underline</u> and <del>strike through</del> text for differences with Alternative B.	<b>M Vote 4-3</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> Mr. Bronkall explained that Public Works was in support of Alternative B. <b>Straw vote</b> <b>Commissioners Smith, Mayo and Nelson supported Alternative B</b>		

Plan Alternative				Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
				<b>Commissioners Kreb, Faust, Emad and Gearheart supported Alternative A as revised by the CSWG.</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C- IM11. Transit Service to East, South and North County.</b> Pursue funding and partnerships with the Humboldt Transit Authority, Native American tribes, and non-profit transportation organizations to establish and sustain transit services to rural communities <del>in the eastern, southern, and northern portions of the county.</del>		<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>Unanimous support of staff language with the deletion of "...in Eastern southern and northern portions of the county".</b>		
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>			<b>C-IM12. Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plan.</b> <del>Public Works shall prepare</del> Prepare a Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plan consistent with the Regional Transportation Plan and incorporate appropriate implementation standards in Title III—Land Use and Development Division 2 Subdivision Regulations. <u>The Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plan should be coordinated with a Long-term Transit Plan.</u>		<b>M Vote 7-0</b>
				<b>COMMENTS: 1-13-11</b> <b>All support as modified by the CSWG with the removal of "Public Works shall".</b>		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>5-4200.1.</b> Revise the County Zoning Ordinance parking requirements. Responsibility: Planning Priority: 1 Schedule: In process Cost: Already budgeted Remarks: This revision is presently in hearing before the Board of Supervisors.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>5-4200.2.</b> Need for drainage plans shall be identified as part of each community plan where drainage is an existing development constraint or could be under planned densities of new development. Responsibility: Planning Priority: 1 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 0 Remarks: Part of the community planning process.		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>5-4200.3.</b> Encourage ride-sharing and greater use of public transit. Responsibility: Board of Supervisors Priority: 3 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: Minimal		<b>D</b>
			<b>D</b>	<b>5-4200.4.</b> Investigate the feasibility of reserving transportation development act funds for allocation to bicycle and pedestrian programs. Responsibility: Public Works Priority: 3 Schedule: TBD Cost: 3 M/D		<b>D</b>

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.1.</b> Review and update the trails map consistent with other adopted County plans and Board policy. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 2 Schedule: As needed Cost: 3 M/D</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.2.</b> Maximize the use of volunteer services or other low cost options to determine methods for acquisition, development and maintenance of trails. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 1 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 10 M/D/year</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.3</b> Develop ongoing traffic safety and trail user education programs. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 4 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 10 M/D/year</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.4</b> Determine trail routes which may be safely used by bicyclists, equestrians, and hikers of all ages and skills. Responsibility: Parks and Public Works Priority: 1 Schedule: Target date 12/84 Cost: 20 M/D/year</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.5</b> Adequately enforce trail use regulations. Responsibility: Parks and Sheriff Priority: 2 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 15 M/D/year</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.6</b> Adopt necessary ordinances pertaining to trail use violations which provide for direct monetary penalty via infraction. Responsibility: Parks/Counsel Priority: 1 Schedule: 4/83 Cost: 3 M/D</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.7</b> Adopt trail designs which minimize trail maintenance requirements. Responsibility: Parks/Public Works Priority: 2 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 1 M/D Remarks: Basic standards are already adopted.</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.8</b> Encourage public and agency participation in all phases of trails establishments. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 2 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 5 M/D/year</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.9</b> Establish an annual capital improvement and project priority program. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 2 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 2 M/D/year Remarks: Budget process</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.10</b> Maintain a comprehensive inventory of potential trail routes. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 3 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 3 M/D/year Remarks: Trails Plan reviews accomplishes this measure; in cooperation with Planning.</p>		D
	<p><b>D 5-4300.11</b> Monitor accident data and impacts resulting from implementation of any portions of the trails section of the General Plan.</p>		D

Plan Alternative	Chapter 7 Circulation Element	Staff Remarks/ Implementation	Position R,M,D
	Responsibility: Public works Traffic Engineers Priority: 3 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 1/2 M/D/year Remarks: This is an ongoing accident review process.		
D	<b>5-4300.12</b> Conduct periodic reviews of the trails section of the General Plan in conjunction with the reviews of the recreation plan as needed. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 2 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 3 M/D/year Remarks: In coordination with Planning Department.		D
D	<b>5-4300.13</b> The highest priority for the use of limited funds should be placed on those project features where volunteers or special service programs cannot be utilized. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 2 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 0 Remarks: This is a policy rather than an implementation program.		D
D	<b>5-4300.14</b> Maintenance should be coordinated through the Public Works Department. Responsibility: Parks and Roads Priority: 3 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 1 M/D/year		D
D	<b>5-4300.15</b> Funding for the trails program should come from Federal, State, and County Government, trail user fees, and public donation. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 1 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 20 M/D/year Remarks: Cost includes time for planning, design and administration of projects.		D
D	<b>5-4300.16</b> The County Parks and Recreation Commission shall act in an advisory capacity to the Board of Supervisors and shall review and recommend policy regarding public trails in Humboldt County and shall conduct periodic reviews of the trails program. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 2 Schedule: Ongoing Cost: 8 M/D/year Remarks: In connection with County Planning Commission.		D
D	<b>5-4300.17</b> Continue to investigate the feasibility of a trail permit system. Responsibility: Parks Priority: 4 Schedule: As needed Cost: 3 M/D Remarks: All County maintained trails are currently on public property.		D
D	<b>5-4300.18</b> Define standards to determine inadequate access. Responsibility: Planning Priority: 4 Schedule: To be determined Cost: 3 M/D Remarks: Revise to read "...determine inadequate public access; access standards have been developed in the coastal planning process."		D

