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Question 1:

- California state law on Complete Streets requires cities to integrate Complete Street policies in the update of their general plan.

- Please explain your perspective on how cities can implement effective policies and introduce immediate and long term change to encourage the implementation of Complete Streets?
Anything is POSSIBLE!
We Keep Carlsbad Moving...

By providing a transportation system valued by all who live, work and play in Carlsbad.
Five Major Goals

- Multi-modal transportation initiatives keep Carlsbad moving and contribute positively to the quality of life in Carlsbad
- A productive, skilled, empowered, and engaged workforce
- Effective performance measurement/feedback
- Effective work order system
- Current “Best Practices” business processes
Operating Values

- Leadership
- Innovation
- Accountability
- Effectiveness
Design Advertise Defend
The Changes

- Traffic Signal Upgrade Program
- Envision Carlsbad Process
- Carlsbad Residential Traffic Management Program
- Redefining our Users
- Complete or Livable Streets Initiative
Community Vision and Values

- Walking, biking, public transportation and connectivity
- Sustainability
- Neighborhood revitalization, community design and livability
- Small town feel, beach community character and connectedness
Carlsbad Residential Traffic Management Program

- Designed to solicit and encourage active neighborhood participation
- Education, Engineering, Enforcement, Enhancement
- Improve quality of life
- Create safer streets
Carlsbad Residential Traffic Management Program

- Phase I: Enforcement and Education
- Phase II: Traffic Management ← NEW
- Phase III: Traffic Calming
Strong General Plan & Community policies giving high priority to:

- Bicycles
- Pedestrians
- Transit

Plan updates identifying smaller areas/corridors where vehicle LOS is offset by improvements to other modes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Street</th>
<th>Prioritized Modes</th>
<th>Non-Prioritized Modes</th>
<th>Prohibited Modes</th>
<th>Sample Street Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Boulevard, Discovery to Grand</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Bicycle]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Multi-Way Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe Road, Twin Oaks Valley Road</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Bicycle]</td>
<td>Arterial with Class II or Class III bike facility and sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Road, Rural Parts of Twin Oaks Valley Road</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial with Enhanced Bike/Ped Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway State Route 78 (SR-78)</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Bicycle]</td>
<td>Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Bicycle]</td>
<td>Collector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle/Pedestrial Trails</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Class I Bike/Ped Path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Streets</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Bicycle]</td>
<td>Neighborhood Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Streets</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td>![Bicycle]</td>
<td>Industrial Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street (University District)</td>
<td>![Pedestrian]</td>
<td>![Car]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Main Street Concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Priorities: Pedestrian, Bicycle/Non-motorized, Vehicles, Transit/Bus service
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Transit</th>
<th>Bicycle</th>
<th>Pedestrian</th>
<th>Vehicular</th>
<th>Sample Street Typology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Marcos Boulevard, Discovery to Grand</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los C]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>Multi-Way Boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rancho Santa Fe Road, Twin Oaks Valley Road</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>Arterial with Class II or Class III bike facility and sidewalks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Road</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los C]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>Arterial with Enhanced Bike/Pedestrian Facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR-78</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![X]</td>
<td>![X]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectors</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los C]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>Collectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike/Pedestrian Trails</td>
<td>![X]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los C]</td>
<td>![X]</td>
<td>Class I Bike/Ped Paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Streets</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los C]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>Neighborhood Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Streets</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>Industrial Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Street (University District)</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los D]</td>
<td>![Los C]</td>
<td>![Los E]</td>
<td>Main Street Concept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Short-Term Solutions

- Specific Plans focused on:
  - Corridors
  - Transit oriented development areas

- Focused General Plan, Community Plan, and Specific Plan amendments
Senate Bill 97 passed in 2010 introduced amendments to CEQA that provide flexibility in transportation analysis.

Please share your perspective on how these amendments have effectively changed the method and findings of transportation analysis in regards to Complete Streets?
How have amendments changed transportation analysis in regards to complete streets?

- CEQA Guidelines re: Transportation/Traffic amended in 2010 due to SB 97
- Four changes to checklist questions:
  - Question (a) changed focus from increase in traffic at a given location to effect of project on overall circulation system in project area
  - Question (b) clarified role of a congestion management program in CEQA analysis
  - Question (f) re: parking was deleted
  - Prior question (g), now question (f), changed to focus on performance and safety of alternative modes
How substantial are the changes?

- Land Use guidelines already required consistency analysis with land use plans, many of which have Complete Streets policies.
- Reinforces that increased traffic at a given location doesn’t necessarily trigger potentially significant impact.
- Moves away from LOS and focuses on effect of projects on pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.
- Deletion of parking question is major change, but indirect impact analysis still required.
Questions 3 and 4:

- How can CEQA significance thresholds and analysis help cities and counties overcome their current dilemma associated with implementing Complete Streets when traffic impacts are always significant requiring mitigation?

- How much flexibility does an agency have in choosing a threshold?
Mitigation Issues

- CEQA requires adoption of all feasible mitigation measures for significant impacts
- No change unless “Complete Streets-friendly” thresholds are applied or adopted
If no significant impact on circulation system as a whole, despite increased traffic at a given location, no mitigation required

Substantial evidence must support no impact finding

Funding would then need to come from non-CEQA mechanisms such as TIF, other exactions

Requirement to fund improvements must have nexus and rough proportionality to project
If significant impact on circulation system as a whole, mitigation required
If no adopted plan is in place for improvements, it is not feasible to mitigate
Agencies could develop programs to fund pedestrian and bike improvements that developers can then contribute a fair share towards
Best basis for updating thresholds is General Plan, Community Plan and Specific Plan policy

Combine policy plan update with significance thresholds update using a single CEQA document
Transportation Food Chain
Why we Build Roads Bigger and Wider...

Designed for the largest users in the food chain
Pedestrians are the Indicator Species...

“Perhaps walking is best imagined as an 'indicator species,' to use an ecologist's term. An indicator species signifies the health of an ecosystem, and its endangerment or diminishment can be an early warning sign of systemic trouble.

Rebecca Solnit, author of Wonderlust: A History of Walking
Thresholds for Pedestrians Public Health
Pedestrian Endangered Species Act

- **Identify** Situations and what you do and don’t like
- **Ask** “Why”
- **Review** Policies, Goals, and Objectives
- **Change** Policies, Goals, and Objectives
- **Put** thresholds in place to protect pedestrians
Definition of Complete or “Livable Streets”

- Creates welcoming and inviting streets
- Improves Quality of Life
- Balances moving people, not just cars
- Walking, biking and public transportation
- Enhances safety
- Enhances economic vitality
Livable Streets Exist in Carlsbad
Connections to Transit
Traffic Circles in Residential Areas
Traffic Circles in Residential Areas
How much flexibility does an agency have in adopting significance thresholds?

- Agencies can choose methodology for CEQA analysis
  - No iron-clad definition of significance
  - Wide variety of models which may be appropriate

- Agencies can apply thresholds of other agencies
  - Could be interim solution for agencies without “Complete Streets-friendly” thresholds
  - Agencies should do thorough job explaining why another threshold is appropriate and properly applied

- Agencies have much flexibility in determining if a project overall “complies” with a plan
Narrower Streets and Bulbouts
Narrower Streets and Bulbouts
Median Entry Features
Median Midblock & Tree Well Features
Question 5:

- Many would say that change is hard within local government because of risk and precedence.

How do you suggest we overcome these obstacles that restrict change?
Carlsbad Blvd over Buena Vista Lagoon
Before
Carlsbad Blvd over Buena Vista Lagoon
After
Carlsbad Boulevard/State Street
Welcome to Carlsbad
Carlsbad Boulevard/State Street Before
Welcome to Carlsbad
Carlsbad Boulevard/State Street After
Welcome to Carlsbad
Carlsbad Boulevard/State Street Before
Welcome to Carlsbad
Carlsbad Boulevard/State Street After
The Tradeoffs

- Costs
- Safety
- Speed
- Convenience
- Volume
- Infill Development
- Sustainable Transportation Modes
- Physical Space
- Air Quality, Greenhouse Gasses, Public Health
END
Traffic Control Changes are Generally Categorically Exempt
  - Traffic Signals, Signs, Markings

Changes in travel lanes can result in impacts to vehicles
  - Road Diets

Categorical Exemptions not intended to conceal impacts

Conservative Approach: Conduct CEQA more than minimum CEQA analysis
San Francisco Bikeway Program

- Long Mileage of Facilities requiring Lane Reductions
- Probably not too Many Impact
- No Environmental Analysis (Categoric Exemption)
- Stopped by Legal Challenge for Three Years
  - While EIR was prepared that showed minimal impacts
Long Beach Bikeway Program

- Concern over Downtown Cycle Tracks
  - Loss of Travel Lane
  - Loss of Some Parking
  - General Plan

- Traffic Study and Negative Declaration Prepared
  - Turned Away Idle Threats

- No Delays to Project
  - Concurrent with Design Preparation
Proposed Bike Lanes on Many Miles of Important Roadways by eliminating travel lanes or parking

Traffic Impacts vary from minimal to severe

EIR document in progress

Has potentially delayed low impact improvements
Remedies

- Modify Agency Guidelines and Significance Criteria
- Assess Multi-Modal Level of Service
- Clarify or Change CEQA Procedures via Legislation
Modify Agency Guidelines

- Review General Plan Goals and Objectives
  - Traffic Level of Service
- Establish Policies for All Modes
- Redefine Significant Impacts
- Establish Simple Criteria for Modest Improvements
  - Road Diets up to 15,000 daily vehicles
Multi-Modal Level of Service

- A through F letter grade Scale
- Autos
- Pedestrians
- Bicycles
- Transit
  - Impact of Automobile traffic mitigations on other modes
    - Not routinely done at this time
Change CEQA Procedures

- Potential Legislation Areas:
  - Clarify Categorical Exemption for Active Transportation Infrastructure
  - Clarify Definition of Unavoidable Adverse Impacts for Active Transportation Infrastructure

- CEQA should spell out any Approved Alternative Process
Other Sources of Reluctance

- Financial and Staffing Resources
  - Ped/bike Coordinator position
- Liability
- Greater Leadership Needed from the top
Innovative Treatments are Years ahead of Standards and Guidelines

Crashes involving pedestrians and bicycles are frequently litigated, due to extent of injuries

Adherence to Standards is Classic Defense
  - Often, but not Always Successful

Some Immunity Available for Demonstration Projects
  - Untested Theory
  - May not work for 2nd or 3rd Incident
Great Concern over California’s Deep Pocket laws

Some activities with Inherent but tolerable risk have special liability rules

- Skiing, Mountain Biking, Skate Board Parks, Trail Hiking, Some Bike Trails
- Special Legislation Required

May Impair Ability of Injured parties to Receive Compensation

- Pedestrians and Bicyclists!
Liability Remedies

- Programmatic Safety Benefits
  - Portland, University Cities, Safety in Numbers
  - Effectiveness of Defenses Unknown

- Health Benefit Arguments
  - Strong, but not well known to transportation agencies
  - Health savings do not accrue to local governments

- Is now the time to seek liability protections?