Questions & Changes FOBCP 9/22/10 Meeting
By James Rae

Holistic view of FOBCP and DEIR raises some disturbing facts:
DEIR pg. 7-22 The project will generate 60,045 trips each day in addition to the 115,700 existing trips in the FOBC. This is a 52% increase in traffic in Carmichael. Is this the “overarching benefit” that is envisioned?
Each new Dwelling Unit generates about 10 trips per day.
12 roadway segments and 7 intersections will be significantly impacted and will operate at LOS F.
DEIR pg. 7-54. The higher density land uses for the FOBC result in an increase in 256,000 VMT in the Region. Where is the envisioned reduction in VMT?

CAPACITY IMPROVEMENTS

1. Ref. DEIR, pg. 7-23: Now that the DEIR has revealed the many significant traffic impacts the project will have on the community is there support to reconsider making FOB 6 lanes between Engle and Marconi?

2. Ref. FOBCP pg. 4-3: Make the median on FOB between Engle and Marconi 34’ wide instead of 12’ to allow for two additional 11’ traffic lanes or exclusive transit lanes in the future when needed. This would retain 6 lane R/W as was done for Watt Ave. between FOB and Arden.

3. Ref: DEIR pg. 7-6, 7: To help reduce the level of traffic congestion on Engle Rd. widen FOB to 3 lanes in the SB direction between Engle Rd. and Grant Ave. with a transition to two lanes adjacent to the park south of Grant. This would move the SB bottleneck a block to the south and reduce the amount of traffic overflowing on to Engle because overflow traffic would have two additional routes (Grant/Whitney or Grant/Park access Rd/North Ave.) available to avoid the bottleneck. It would match the widening to 3 lanes NB between Grant and Shirley shown on Plates TC-4 & 5 where widening is apparently considered to be feasible.

SMART GROWTH STREETS

4. Ref: FOBCP pg. 1-8, SR Addendum #1 Attachment D, SS-7 & SS-8. Add the following to the Objective preceding SS-7 & SS-8:

Objective: Create communities and corridors using a holistic perspective when considering land uses and the design context of street and corridor improvements.

No two streets, nor two communities, are the same. As such, the concept of smart growth and sustainable streets encourages a holistic perspective of considering land uses and the design context of street and corridor improvements to allow them to be “tailored” to the area and the surrounding community. Implementing this concept will entail holistic and innovative corridor analysis techniques to account for increased
pedestrian, bicycle and transit usage and regional VMT reductions associated with Smart Growth Street improvements. Such an analysis may lead to the conclusion that a reduced LOS for motor vehicles is acceptable in certain instances provided that the land uses and enhancements to other modes of travel result in an overall positive benefit to mobility and access and may also reduce VMT. **LOS F represents a failure to provide sufficient roadway capacity to accommodate the auto traffic generated by land uses tributary to the smart street. If it is not feasible to provide additional roadway capacity then development that generates additional auto trips should be limited.** The County recognizes that within specific defined corridors that a highly coordinated and interconnected land uses and transportation infrastructure can result in improved walkability, bicycle use, transit opportunities and other forms of mobility, which can result in an environmental benefit and enhancements to a community. Where a corridor planning analysis indicates that motor vehicular travel will operate at LOS F, fees may be assessed to improve other modes of travel, such as enhancements to bicycle, pedestrian, transit, and public realm amenities, to encourage and facilitate travel through alternative, non-automobile modes of travel. **SGS should recognize that they will remain major corridors for through auto traffic that should be accommodated on the SGS and not shifted to neighborhood streets surrounding it.**

5. Add to the end of the Policy SS-7 this statement:  
**SGS should recognize that they will remain major corridors for through auto traffic that should be accommodated on the SGS and not shifted to neighborhood streets surrounding it.**

This change is consistent with the policy originated in the CCAP and carried through to the FOBCP. It will avoid increasing VMT on circuitous routes through neighborhoods to avoid congestion on the SGS. An analogy for sewer infrastructure can be seen in PF-6 & PF-8 (see pg. 5-14 DEIR). Sewers should not overflow into neighborhoods and neither should auto traffic.

6. Revise Smart Growth Streets Policy SS-8 as shown below to eliminate reference to the acceptability of LOS F and add that achieving a minimum LOS E should be done by limiting infill development to the capacity of roadway infrastructure available to support it.

**SS-8. On a Smart Growth street, the County shall strive to maintain operations and capacity on urban roadways and intersections at LOS E or better, unless maintaining this LOS would, in the County’s judgment, be infeasible and conflict with the achievement of other Smart Growth street objectives. Congestion in excess of LOS E may be acceptable provided that provisions are made to improve overall mobility, reduce overall VMT and/or promote non-automobile transportation. Smart Growth infill shall not be approved until it is feasible to provide roadway infrastructure capacity for at least LOS E on the smart streets.**

This proposed revision is consistent with the Goal of the SGS policy:
GOAL: “Smart Growth Streets” that enable safe and efficient mobility and access for all users while positively contributing to the adjacent corridor, surrounding community and natural environment.

Accepting LOS F is the policy that is contrary to the SGS goal in every respect. It is not safe and efficient for any mode and negatively impacts the surrounding community and natural environment. It is the worst level of service and will have many adverse impacts such as pedestrians waiting longer to cross the street, bicycles competing with auto traffic in turn lanes, transit busses stuck in traffic, increased air pollution due to stop and go traffic, and autos diverting to adjacent neighborhood collector streets thus increasing VMT due to circuitous routings.

This proposed revision is consistent with GP Update LU-5: “The County shall give priority to residential development on vacant or underutilized sites within existing urban areas that have infrastructure capacity available”.

7. Ref: SR pg.7, & Addendum #1 Attachment E SS-10
V/C ratios have proven useful for auto LOS but If DOT has not established different standards for other modes how can the FOBC be evaluated using them? The overall mobility LOS should be an average of all modes weighted according to usage.

PHASING AND REPORTING

8. Ref: DEIR pg. 7-59 TC-1, FOBCP pg.5-10 C-5, SR pg. 21, & SR Addendum #1 Pg. 7.
Expand the Phasing Plan described in C-5 and TC-1 to include all the 12 roadway segments and 7 intersections listed on pgs. 7-23 to 7-28 in the DEIR that will be significantly impacted by the proposed infill development and are expected to exceed the volume thresholds for LOS E. For those segments and intersections for which no feasible mitigation is available the Phasing Plan shall limit infill development to the capacity of roadway infrastructure available to support it so that LOS E will be maintained on these roadways.

9. Ref: FOBCP pg. 5-4 and pg. 5-9 B-5.
Add LOS for the 12 roadway segments and 7 intersections listed on pgs. 7-23 to 7-28 in the DEIR to annual report requirements.

GENERAL

How can the SGS designation for the stretch from Marconi to Manzanita be 4 lanes when part of it is already 6 lanes and plan shows 6 lanes from Grant north?
A.2. General Plan Amendments. Findings are in Section IV.B and III. C is not Conditions.
A.3. GP Amendment. Should this be Smart Growth Street rather than Sustainable Street?
A.4. GP Amendment. Change from Arterial to “Smart Growth Arterial” rather than Sustainable Street
A.5. GP Amendment. Change from Thoroughfare to “Smart Growth Thoroughfare” rather than Sustainable Street.
These last two changes would preserve the functional classification system in the GP to insure that SGS do not ignore the essential function of accommodating regional auto traffic on FOB where 80% of the traffic between Marconi & Engle is through traffic.

For improved Community Identity why not change the name of FOB to Carmichael Blvd. within Carmichael?

Questions re not allowed uses in Manzanita District for example: Auto Parts sales, Firearm sales, Second-hand/Thrift Store, Vehicle Services, Recycling, (see marked up tables).
Restricting uses will require residents to drive further and increase VMT. Was this considered?