Framework Review Form

Date: 5/1/24

Committee: Pedestrian & Bicycle Advisory Committee

Committee Member Name: Darren Racusen

Framework Title (please complete one form per Framework): Mobility

---

In light of **the Vision, Pillars, and Guiding Principles** prepared by GPA and accepted by City Council (https://www.planpetaluma.org/documents#gpuvision):

What are the <u>most important</u> policies in this framework? We recommend identifying the top 5 (or fewer) policies and ranking them in order of importance.

Policy	Explanation
TP-1.1	Worth mentioning new street standards? Are those the "Green Standards" mentioned in 1.2? Consider identifying easements like Rovina Ln (maybe that's covered in Action TP-1.1.5)
TP-1.2	Greening our mobility network will make it more usable, alongside all the benefits that come with more permeable surfaces and a more robust urban canopy (incl. urban design & property values!). It may be detailed in Standards – but worth setting coverage goals? And assigning maintenance of canopy along the mobility network (including PROW?)
TP-3.5 & TP-5.1	Transit and planning around that infrastructure is the answer to better connectivity and reducing auto use. Should Actions TP-3.4.2, TP-3.5.4 and/or TP 5.1.1 specifically mention focus the "15-minute activity center" concept around transit?
All policies under Goal TP-6 (especially policies TP-6.2, TP-6.3, TP-6.5)	Practical Implementation considerations are important and I like that this addresses the need to identify and fill funding gaps, analyze costs and coordinate with regional, state and federal actors. Also like feedback loops that allow us to assess each policy's effectiveness and adapt accordingly - incredibly important (TP-6.2)
All of Goal TP-4	Prioritizing safety for network users is paramount as we pursue all objectives here – could easily be #1
TP-5.5 *Honorable Mention I'm glad was included*	Key considerations mentioned here to support existing economic and production infrastructure given our goals in the Economic Framework

What <u>concerns</u> do you have about the policies in this framework? For example, are they unclear? Should they be softened or strengthened? Do you disagree with the policy direction?

Policy	Explanation
TP-3.1	Any more specific metrics we can look at to make sure we achieve this? Ie. distance between mobility network and centers of importance (COI), % ADA accessibility of mobility network. Seeing Policies TP-3.4, TP-4.1, TP-4.2 do we even need this as

	constructed or can the statement embodied by this be implicit throughout somehow – or is it already? Should we make this more about establishing feedback with cross-sections of the community to make sure we are identifying issues that arise for certain segments of the community and adapting?
15-minue activity centers concept (mentioned in TP-3.4, TP-3.5, TP-5.1)	Bring all those mentions under one goal umbrella with something like "Design 15-minute activity centers to be centered around transit and multi-model connectivity hubs"? Maybe I'm implying a change to 15-minute concept as it is now, but I really think that should overlap with transit network buildout
TP-2.1	Make sure we are accurately calculating GHG current conditions and goals with new electric car regulations in mind. Should see reductions in GHG – but maybe not with embodied costs of electric batteries? Need to check the math!
TP-2.3	Tough to have good metrics for "carbon neutrality or better" (require developers to show calculations?) and projects can ask for overriding considerations out of VMT guidelines (Davidon). Any better/firmer guidance we can give? Maybe work to develop a metric/score to rate ATP and/or transit access for a project?
TP-3.2	Very Important (could be in previous section) Coordination with regional transit and ATP networks implied in Action TP-3.2.1, which is critical to making some of this work given our existing commuter conditions. However, lots of inherent challenges here that need to be addressed and lots of other parties we would need to get alignment with. Not sure how we can translate more tangible solutions here.
TP-5.4	Action TP-5.4.2: For developments, in lieu fees for bike parking? Some developers (ie. Spirit Living) won't have residents that necessarily need the bike parking and we don't want to limit feasibility of projects to include this. Action TP-5.4.4: Need to be very careful with this – maybe only commercial developments?
TP-5.3	Context, details and implementation of TDM – what is it? What are incentives and/or penalties? Needs plenty of background

Please submit this as a word document via email to your staff liaison at the conclusion of your meeting as part of the public record.