

DISCUSSION:

At the January 14, 2013 meeting, the Board reviewed the Circulation Element (Chapter 7) of the Planning Commission Approved Draft General Plan, including the final policy recommendations from the GPU Ad Hoc Working Group for Chapter 7. The Board then began deliberation and straw voting on the Circulation Element.

The Board provided straw votes on the following policies (see Attachment A for tally of the Board's straw votes and any recommended revisions):

- C-G1. Circulation System Safety and Functionality (add clarification of "users")
- C-G2. Balanced Transportation Opportunities
- C-G3. Interagency Cooperation (with minor editing of verb tense)
- C-G4. Active Transportation
- C-GX. Healthy Transportation (with minor editing of verb tense)
- C-GXX. Transportation Security
- New C-GXXX. Movement of Goods
- C-P1. Orderly Development
- C-P3. Consideration of Transportation Impacts in Land Use Decision Making
- C-P5. Level of Service Criteria
- C-P6. Jurisdictional Coordination and Integration
- C-P7. Joint Use of Traffic Models
- C-P8. Coordination Between County Agencies
- C-P11. Roadway Functional Classifications
- C-P13. Prioritization of Investments
- C-P14. Efficiency and Capacity
- C-P15. Roadway and Multi-modal Facility Maintenance
- C-P17. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements
- C-P18. Coordination with School Districts
- C-P19. Best Management Practices for Road Grading
- C-P20. Best Practices for County Road Maintenance
- C-P22. Public Transit
- C-Pxx. Long Term Transit Plan
- C-Pxxx. Long Term Transit Plan
- C-P24. Investment in Improvements
- C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards
- C-P26. Bicycles and Pedestrian Facilities in New Subdivisions
- C-P27. Right-of-Way Design Standards
- C-P28. Landscape Buffer Strips
- C-P29. Removal of Obstacles in Pathways
- C-P30. On-Street Parking
- C-P31. Design Standards for All Pathways
- C-P33. Protection of Designated Pedestrian and Bicycle Routes
- C-P34. Bicycle Facilities
- C-P35. Development of Railroad Right-of-Ways for Bicycles and Pedestrians
- C-P36. Develop a Regional Trails System
- C-P37. Encourage Equestrian Trails
- C-P41. Movement of Goods
- C-P42. Re-establishing Regional Rail Service
- C-P43. Rail Right-of-Way
- C-P45. Commercial Areas
- C-P47. Frontage Improvements
- New Policy: C-Px7. Highway Improvement
- New Policy: C-Px8. Discretionary Road Funds

- NEW Standard: Developers preference for impact fees
- C-IM4. Regional Coordination
- C-IM4a. Greater Eureka Area Transportation Model
- New IM: Safe Routes to School
- New IM: Direct Driveway Access
- C-IM10. U.S. Highway 101 Safety Corridor Improvements
- New IM: Municipal Advisory Committees
- New IM: Encourage Bicycle and Pedestrian-Friendly development

The Board requested staff return with additional information on the following policies (which are discussed in greater detail below):

- C-P12. Multi-modal Level of Service/Quality of Service Criteria
- C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards

The Board proposes to finish deliberation on the remainder of the Circulation Element items for the meeting of January 28th, Following is a list of the outstanding policy decisions presented in categories originally proposed for the Board meeting of January 14th and discussed in greater details in Attachment A:

Staff recommends adding to the "short list" for Board discussion:

- New Policy: C-Px5. County-Wide Transportation Plan (AKA C-P#)
- C-IM1a County-Wide Transportation Plan Implementation
- C-P2. Consideration of Land Uses in Transportation Decision Making
- C-P4. Mitigation Measures
- C-P9. Acceptance of Roads into the County Maintained Road System
- C-P10. Right-of-Ways as Public Facilities
- C-P21. State and Federal Consistency
- C-P23. Public Transit Service
- C-Px. Circulation Planning for Bicycles, Pedestrians and Transit
- C-Pxxxx. Investment in Public Transportation
- C-P32. Traffic Calming
- C-P49. Bus Turnouts

Ad hoc group has no comments:

- C-P38. Channel Maintenance
- C-P39. Commercial Fishing Facilities
- C-P40. Public Infrastructure Supporting Private Investment
- C-P44. Expansion of Airline Service

Ad hoc group has not yet reviewed:

- C-S1. Functional Classifications
- C-S2. Neighborhood Connectivity
- C-S3. Traffic Thresholds of Significance
- C-S4. Pavement Management Criteria
- C-S5. Prioritizing Transportation Capital Expenditures
- C-S6. Prioritizing Road Maintenance Projects
- C-S7. Transit, Bicycle, and Pedestrian Quality/Level of Service Standards
- C-S8. Pedestrian and Bicycle System
- C-S9. Prioritization of Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities and Routes
- C-S10. Equestrian Trails
- C-IM1. Circulation Standards
- C-IM2. Tracking Road Improvement Requirements

- C-IM3. Road Abandonment
- C-IM5. Roadway System Construction
- C-IM7. Transit Infrastructure
- C-IM8. Park and Ride Facilities
- C-IM9. Adoption of Water Quality and Stream Habitat Protection Measures
- C-IM11. Transit Service to East, South and North County
- C-IM12. Pedestrian and Bicycle System Plan

Outstanding Issues

1. C-P12. Multi-modal Level of Service/Quality of Service Criteria and C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards.

There was concern from staff that there was too much duplicity between P12 and P25 which was causing unnecessary confusion. The Board requested that staff return with possible revisions to P12 and P25 that would provide additional clarity.

The Draft Plan currently reads:

C-P12. Multi-modal Level of Service/Quality of Service Criteria. The County shall specify and endeavor to maintain minimum multi-modal Levels of Service (LOS) and Quality of Service (QOS) standards on County roads and use LOS/QOS criteria as a basis for analyzing impact fees and assessments, prioritizing congestion relief projects, and evaluating cumulative traffic impacts of discretionary development.

C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards. Use objective Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service 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 quality and capacity of county roads and intersections. Analyze neighborhood level conditions using objective methods and criteria such as "walkability audits" and "bikeability audits".

The GPU Ad Hoc Working Group made the following recommended revisions for P12 and P25:

C-P12. Objective methods for assessing multi-modal Transportation Impacts. The County shall specify and endeavor to maintain minimum multi-modal Levels of Service (LOS) and Quality of Service (QOS) standards on County roads and use LOS/QOS criteria as specified in the County-Wide Transportation Plan as a basis for analyzing impact fees and assessments, prioritizing congestion relief projects, and evaluating cumulative traffic impacts of discretionary development using objective methods and criteria such as transportation plans "walkability audits" and "bikeability audits".

C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards. Use objective Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service 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 quality and capacity of county roads and intersections. Analyze neighborhood level conditions using objective methods and criteria such as "walkability

audits" and "bikeability audits" suitable for the locality to assess and plan the multi-modal quality and capacity of county roads and intersections. (*Ad hoc group recom*

Staff recommended revisions for the January 14th meeting:

C-P12 - Support ad hoc group's recommendations.

C-P25 - Support ad hoc group's recommendations with minor edits:

C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards. Use objective methods and criteria ~~such as to formulate level of service and quality of service standards which consider~~ "walkability audits" and "bikeability audits" suitable for the locality to assess and plan the multi-modal quality and capacity of county roads and intersections.

Also, staff recommended developing the appropriate standards as part of the implementation measure, C-IM1. **Circulation Standards.**

Staff recommends the following changes:

C-P12 – Delete; its provisions are adequately addressed by the new C-P25.

C-P25 - Support ad hoc group's recommendations with minor edits:

"C-P25. Multimodal Level of Service and Quality of Service Standards. Use objective methods and criteria ~~such as to formulate level of service and quality of service standards which consider~~ "walkability audits" and "bikeability audits" suitable for the locality to assess and plan the multi-modal quality and capacity of county roads and intersections."

Staff continues to recommend developing appropriate standards as part of the implementation measure, C-IM1. **Circulation Standards.** No modifications to that implementation measure are needed since it is already sufficiently broad to include the standards in C-P25.

Continued Review of the Draft Plan:

Following deliberation of the Circulation Element, staff recommends that your Board return to deliberating on the remainder of the Infrastructure Element (starting with IS-S1) on February 11th. During the meeting of January 14th, the Board requested that staff prepare a summary of the deliberation and straw voting by the Board on the Infrastructure Element, including the past Board reports and attachments as background information, with the intention of distributing this information to the GPU Ad Hoc Working Group for review. This has been prepared and is included in your Board report as Attachment B.

FINANCIAL IMPACT:

Awarded grants, General Plan user fees, and the General Fund contribution to the Advanced Planning Division has paid for the costs of the General Plan Update Program to date.

This project fits into the County's Strategic Framework in several ways.

- The project is consistent with the Mission Statement; the General Plan Update will serve the needs and concerns of the community, and enhance their quality of life. It provides a framework for strategically pursuing a broad range of services provided by the County

and other agencies, and guiding new development toward the goals presented in the Plan.

- The General Plan Update supports the self reliance of the community by clarifying County policy and regulations in a broad number of subject areas, and presenting them in a format that is easy to understand and available on the internet.
- The General Plan Update will safeguard the public trust by establishing clear County policy and regulations guiding new development.
- The proposed implementation measures of the General Plan Update ensure its sustainability over time.
- The General Plan Update increases the transparency, accessibility, and accountability of the services provided by the County by establishing clear roles and procedures, using language that is easy to understand and available on the internet. The General Plan Update promotes interjurisdictional and regional cooperation.
- The General Plan Update is intended to be "an effective voice for our community in areas outside traditional mandates". The General Plan Update includes provisions for public involvement that extend far beyond the requirements of state law. Public involvement encouraged by the General Plan Update will include discussions of natural resource and the County's economic future. The General Plan Update also intends to engage new partners through its implementation measures.

OTHER AGENCY INVOLVEMENT:

The General Plan Update program has been a multi-year project. Multiple agencies have been involved in the review and preparation of the Planning Commission approved Draft General Plan. The County has been in communication with the Planning Commissioners, County Counsel and the County Administrator's office on the transmittal of these draft documents.

ALTERNATIVES TO STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:

Board's discretion.

ATTACHMENTS:

- Attachment A Comparison of Circulation Element Items – Planning Commission, GPU Ad-Hoc Working Group, and Staff Recommendations with Board straw votes
- Attachment B Summary report of the deliberation and straw voting by the Board on the Infrastructure Element

Attachment A

**Comparison of Circulation Element Items –
Planning Commission, GPU Ad-Hoc Working Group,
and Staff Recommendations**

Attachment B

Summary Report of the deliberation and straw voting by the Board on the Infrastructure Element

- Board transmittal memo (dated January 18, 2013)
- Board Straw votes for Chapter 5 (Infrastructure Element)
- Plan Alternative Charts with Planning Commission straw votes for Chapter 5
- Supplemental Report #1, Chapter 5 – Infrastructure Element
- Board Worksheet with staff recommended policy changes (short list items)
- Board report for October 15, 2014 with attachments
- Board report for November 5th and 8th, 2012 (no attachments)
- Board report for December 3, 2012 (no attachments)