

## **Mobility Element CPC Summary Sheet**

The Mobility Element advances a strategy for congestion relief and increased transportation choices in a manner that strengthens the City of Villages land use vision. Policies call for working proactively with regional agencies to plan and fund the transportation projects and services that the City needs. The Mobility and Land Use Elements of the draft General Plan are closely linked. The Land Use Element identifies existing and planned land uses, and the Mobility Element identifies the proposed transportation network and strategies which have been designed to meet the future transportation needs generated by the land uses. Figure ME-1, the Transit/Land Use Connections Map, shows the relationship between existing and planned transit services and the City's planned uses.

Key policies:

- Improve pedestrian and bicyclist safety, accessibility, connectivity, and comfort.
- Support the provision of an urban network of high-frequency transit routes to serve higher density and village areas.
- Increase capacity and reduce congestion on the street and freeway system.
- Proactively work with San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG) to plan and fund projects that the City has identified as high priority. Continue to collaborate with SANDAG to influence transportation system planning, policy development, project prioritization, and financing.
- Expand use of Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to improve the efficiency and safety of the transportation system.
- Use the Pedestrian Improvement Toolbox (Table ME-1), the Traffic Calming Toolbox (Table ME-2), and the Parking Strategies Toolbox (Table ME-3) to develop community-specific solutions as needed.

The CPC General Plan Subcommittee reviewed the July 2005 Draft General Plan Mobility Element on November 7, 2005 and the full CPC made recommendations on the Element on November 29, 2005. The attached table reflects those recommendations, indicates staff's responses, and, if applicable, identifies where new/revised policies are located in the October 2006 Draft General Plan.

## Mobility Element – CPC Summary Sheet Attachment

<b>CPC Recommendations on Mobility Element (ME) made at CPC Meeting of November 22, 2005</b>	<b>Staff Responses to CPC Recommendations</b>
<b>References refer to July 2005 Draft General Plan Mobility Element (ME)</b>	<b>References refer to October 2006 Draft General Plan</b>
<b>Subsection A</b> - CPC agreed with staff's suggested reorganization.	Staff deleted this subsection from the Mobility element; the issues it contains are covered in other sections of the General Plan.
<b>Subsection B</b> Discussion (p. ME-53) – Delete the text pertaining to childhood obesity (approved 19-1-1).	Edit was made (p. ME-7)
ME-B.1 (p. ME-54) - Provide more balance between pedestrians and automobiles in a manner that does not worsen the service level for automobile traffic, and delete the text that follows the word "safety"(approved 15-2-3).	The policy (now ME-A.1) references a Pedestrian Improvements Toolbox and calls for design that maximizes pedestrian safety and comfort.
ME-B.2 (p. ME-54) - Apply the Pedestrian Master Plan in a manner that is consistent and complimentary to each community's existing plan (consensus).	The Discussion text now reads: "The PMP is intended to be complementary to the community plans, recognizing that not all community plans currently address pedestrian issues (p. ME-7).
ME-B.5 (p. ME-55) – Emphasize the importance of safety issues, including protecting children from crime (consensus).	Added a new section on Pedestrian Safety and Accessibility, and a reference to Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Measures in what is now policy ME-A.2.e (p. ME-8).
<b>Subsection C</b> (p. ME-57) Overall - Revise to encourage alternative modes, but avoid being detrimental to automobile travel. (approved 12-9-0)	Various edits have been made, such as the revised policy ME-B.10 (p. ME-19), which replaces the July 2005 Draft policy ME-C.3.
<b>Subsection D</b> -(edits approved by consensus) ME-D.1 a,b,c, & e (p. ME-63) - Add " <i>In accordance with approved community plans</i> "	Several policies have been edited to reference community plans. See ME- C.1, ME-C.2.d, & f, and ME-C.3 (pp ME-22- ME-23).
ME-D-6 (p. ME-64) - Edit to state " <i>Protect the safety of pedestrians and the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.</i> "	The revised policy now references a "Traffic Calming Toolbox" and calls for installation of traffic calming measures "to increase the safety and enhance the livability of communities." The revised policy (now ME-C.5) is consistent with the City's draft Traffic Calming Program Handbook.
<b>Subsection G</b> , ME-G.1 (p. ME-70) - State that the City's Bicycle Master Plan should be consistent and complimentary to each community's existing plan.	The Discussion in the revised Bicycling section clarifies that "the Bicycle Master Plan (BMP) is intended to provide a citywide perspective that is enhanced with more detailed community plan level recommendations and refinements" and the new policy ME-F.1.c. states: "Reference and refine the plan (BMP), as needed, in conjunction with community plan updates"(pp.ME-37- ME-38).

ME-G.2 (p. ME-71) -add that a bikeway system network that is continuous and safe, while balanced with the need to preserve pedestrian safety.	The revised policy (now ME-F.2.a) states: "Develop a bikeway network that is continuous, closes gaps in the existing system, improves safety, and serves important destinations (p. ME-38)."
<b>Subsection H</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) ME-H-2 (p. ME-75) – revise to say to the effect: “strive to achieve the efficient use of land devoted to parking through such measures as...”	The revised policy (now ME-G.2.b) states: “Strive to reduce the amount of land devoted to parking through measures such as parking structures and shared use, while still providing appropriate levels of parking (p. ME-42).”
ME-H-2. a - to include the phrase “ <i>existing and funded</i> ” high quality transit.	The revised policy (now ME-G.2.a) includes the phrase “existing and funded transit with a base mid-day service frequency of ten to fifteen minutes ...”
<b>Subsection K</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) Discussion (p. ME-84) – edit to reflect the fact most of San Diego’s air cargo comes from outside the County (Los Angeles or Mexico).	Section J (p. ME-48) states that "virtually all of San Diego's goods are imported from outside of the region" and the revised Airports Section (Section H) contains discussion and policies related to the need to support forecasted air cargo demand (pp. ME-42- ME-46).
ME-K.1 (p. ME-84) - add language to “ <i>Support and pursue State and Federal funding for infrastructure improvements and use of...</i> ”	The revised policy ME-K.1 (p. ME-53) calls for the City to “identify and prioritize ... projects for inclusion in the City of San Diego’s annual Capital Improvements Program (CIP) and to guide the City’s applications for regional, state or federal funds ...). See also Public Facilities, Services and Safety Element (PF) Policy PF-B.3).
ME-K.2 (p. ME-84) - Add “ <i>port of entry</i> ” to the list of transportation facilities to be preserved.	This topic is covered in the revised Economic Prosperity Element Section J – International Trade, Maritime Trade, and Border Relations (pp. EP-29- EP-32).
New ME-K.8 - Add a new subsection with the text: “ <i>Collaborate with the Government of Mexico to plan for future border crossings, including location, technology, and preservation of the road network.</i> ”	This topic is covered in the revised Economic Prosperity Element Section J – International Trade, Maritime Trade, and Border Relations (pp. EP-29- EP-32)
<b>Subsection M</b> (edits approved 17-3-1) ME- M.2 – noted that staff recommends moving this to the Public Facilities Element.	This section (now Section K) underwent major edits to move general financing policies to the Public Facilities Element and to add additional discussion on regional coordination (pp. ME-51- ME-53). Policies specific to transportation financing remain in this section.
ME-M-4, Policies 4, 7, 8, 9, and 12 - Edit these policies to reflect that: “It should not be a policy of the General Plan to recommend tax and fee increases. All statements and policies that suggest funds should be raised via tax or fee increases should be left to the discretion of elected representatives, and deleted from the General Plan. However, it is fully appropriate for the General Plan to recommend that the City pursue its maximum fair share of County, State and Federal funding.”	This topic is addressed in the revised Public Facilities Element, Section A – Public Facilities Financing (pp. PF-5- PF-10.
ME-M.11 – Edit as follows: Establish community-based phasing thresholds that link development potential to the <u>availability of existing or planned and funded</u> transportation facilities ...and services.”	This policy was deleted from the Mobility Element and is addressed in the revised Public Facilities Element Section C, see Policy PF-C.4 regarding “timing and sequencing controls on new development (p. PF-15)” and PF-C.6 regarding public facility financing plans (p. PF-16).