

ATTACHMENT 2

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS RELEVANT TO CIRCULATION ELEMENT (CE) DOCUMENT

A number of questions concerning the comprehensive update to the City's Circulation Element have arisen since the Planning Commission recommended approval of the Circulation Element on January 18, 2018. City Staff has compiled a list of the comments staff has received from the public, decision makers, and other interested parties received, along with a brief discussion of the issues relevant to each specific comment. This discussion is followed by a recommendation by staff as to whether from staff's perspective if the comment warrants a possible change to the text and/or map of the updated Circulation Element. City Council members should review the following list of comments and provide direction to staff concerning any desired modifications to the Circulation Element to address issues raised in the following list of comments:

	<u>Submitted By</u>	<u>Comment/Question:</u>	<u>Discussion</u>
1	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Strike Policies 14A and 14A1 located on page 4 of Circulation Element (CE).	These policies are located in the Land Use Element of the General Plan, and cannot be deleted or changed without enlarging the scope of the effort to include other General Plan Elements. In addition, Policy 14A is a broad statement about the relationship between a trail system and the quality of life in the community. Given this context, its deletion would not be appropriate.
2	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	How will the City ensure that traffic from development will not overwhelm the capacity of streets? (<i>as discussed in policy 3B in existing Land Use Element</i>)	The updated CE contains policies (Policy 1A pages 52, 53) that establish performance standards that all new development projects must meet. These performance standards are contained in Tables 4-1 and 4-2 of the CE (pages 52 and 53). Projects are required to prepare Transportation+ Impact Studies as required by Policy 1.B (pages 54 and 55) to document whether the standards can be met, or if improvements need to be made to the road network to achieve the standards.
3	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Revise or remove Refugio Valley Rd, Falcon Way, Turquoise, and Pheasant Dr as Emergency Evacuation Roads?	These roadways are currently stated directly out of Page VI-11 of the existing Safety Element. However, the 2005 EOC Map diagrams contained on the City's website under "Emergency Evacuation Routes", 7 zone maps are available and each zone has several maps. In reviewing all 17 maps, Falcon ,

		<i>(this reference is on bottom of page 4 under the Safety (Adopted 1998, Amended 2015) section</i>	<p>Pheasant and Turquoise are included in the text with arrows on the Alternative Route maps. Additionally, Resnik/Beechnut/Lupine and Redwood are also stated in text on Alternative Maps. Therefore, it would seem appropriate to add these 7 streets as Secondary Evacuation Routes with the dashed green line on Figure 3-15, which is slightly different than what is in the 1998 Safety Element.</p> <p>Additionally, the Planning Commission asked that a secondary evacuation route be shown to connect to Alhambra Valley Road in Pinole via Refugio Valley Rd and Goat Road should there be a blockage of RVR, due to concerns raised in recent fires around the Bay Area.</p> <p>Aside from this, the emergency evacuation routes are depicted in the Safety Element, which the City will be updating this Element of the General Plan once the CE update is completed.</p>
4	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Should Hercules relook at the 1991 Economic Development Strategy? Is the plan out dated?	The reference being made is actually to the City's Economic Development Element, as referenced on page 5 of the CE, which is an optional element in the General Plan and is only indirectly relevant to the CE. However, given that this element of the City's General Plan is approaching 30 years old an update is warranted and should be discussed separately.
5	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Does Hercules have to have the language contained in Policy 5.2 on page 5 for future funding?	The policy comes out of the City's current Housing Element which is certified by the State of California which does require these types of policies be in place to get the Certification, and a Certified Housing Element is required for many grant funding sources.
6	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Should this be removed? Unable to complete. <i>(Referring to the Proposed Actions Watershed Trails policy that starts "Create a loop trail in the middle of the watershed.....Run)."</i>	An important function of a General Plan Element is to explore the full range of possible improvements, in this case trail improvements, which the City may wish to explore in the future. While such a list may not be appropriate for a shorter range plan such as a CIP which typically looks 5 years into the future, the proposed CE update has a horizon year of 2040, 22 years in the

			future and this language is out of the existing adopted Refugio Creek Watershed Vision Plan.
7	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	I have concerns about the Watershed Trail policies given that there don't appear to be plans for any such trails. <i>(Referring to the Proposed Actions Watershed Trails policy that starts "Connect existing trails....Refugio Valley Road)."</i>	An important function of a General Plan Element is to explore the full range of possible improvements, in this case trail improvements, which the City may wish to explore in the future. While such a list may not be appropriate for a shorter range plan such as a CIP which typically look 5 years into the future, the proposed CE update has a horizon year of 2040, 22 years in the future and this language is out of the existing adopted Refugio Creek Watershed Vision Plan.
8	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Should this be removed due to No school planned on being built? <i>(Referring to the Proposed Actions Watershed Trails policy that starts "Construct a boardwalk...Park/School site.)."</i>	An important function of a General Plan Element is to explore the full range of possible improvements, in this case trail improvements, which the City may wish to explore in the future. While such a list may not be appropriate for a shorter range plan such as a CIP which typically look 5 years into the future, the proposed CE update has a horizon year of 2040, 22 years in the future and this language is out of the existing adopted Refugio Creek Watershed Vision Plan.
9	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	This has been completed. Should this bullet be removed? <i>(Referring to the Proposed Actions Watershed Trails policy that starts "Complete the creek trails down to the Bay and San Francisco Bay Trail)."</i>	These have not been completed as it still includes a path along San Pablo Avenue between Sycamore and John Muir Parkway and a widening path project that will be done along John Muir Parkway from San Pablo to Alfred Nobel this year and the current temporary trail at the end of John Muir Parkway is supposed to connect to the Bay through a different alignment not yet constructed directly adjacent to Refugio Creek.
10	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Should SB1 be mentioned and the effects of the bill <i>(on page 8 under the Regional Planning section)?</i>	While the CE does mention the importance of grant programs and similar funding sources in Section 1.B.4 on page 55, it would be appropriate to expand the discussion here instead to state "(....grant funding (such as SB1, Measure J, WCCTAC, STMP, Tiger, CMAQ, STIP, TCRP, and the like) in lieu of adding that discussion to page 8 that talks about the relationship the CE has to other plans.

11	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	<i>(On page 13)</i> ABAG population estimate is off due to several projects not being built as planned. Should the population of 39,500 be reduced to reflect the current growth?	<p>The 2040 population projection of 39,500 estimated by ABAG and referenced in the CE is consistent with what is also stated in the City's existing Housing Element. However, the traffic projections in the CE are based on a number of sources, with ABAG being only one source. The growth projections utilized for the traffic analysis in the CE were based primarily on City staff evaluating vacant and underdeveloped properties in the City and assuming development of those properties based on what the City's land use regulations allow, combined with utilizing development proposals prepared by property owners in the past.</p> <p>For general plan required "consistency", the ABAG population is already in the approved/certified Housing Element and therefore was pulled into the Circulation Element and should not be changed as it also ties into many funding sources. As stated in the paragraph above, the traffic analysis which was done is based on existing Land Use regulation / zoning.</p> <p>Should add a sentence at the end of the 3rd paragraph on page 13 to state the following: "In 2018, it does not currently appear that ABAG's population projection and Regional Housing Needs Analysis numbers might not be able to be accomplished by at the City's build out. The traffic generation was not based on this projected number but based on traffic that could be generated based on the existing land use designations."</p>
12	Dan Romero	<i>(On page 14)</i> I don't agree 93% of all Hercules residents work outside of Hercules. Is this adult residents?	While the percentage of Hercules residents working outside the City may appear to be high, the data is from the U.S. Census 2011-2015 Community Survey, which is the most recent data on this question. The accuracy of the census data given the sample size is estimated to be plus or minus 2%.
13	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Should Transit Loop in Bayfront be deleted? Parcel K <i>(On page 25 on the Street and Circulation Regulating Plan)</i>	Any changes to the Bayfront Master Plan require the concurrence of both the City and the Bayfront property owner, and cannot be modified unilaterally by the City in the General Plan. Aside from this procedural issue, any change to the Transit Loop is best handled in conjunction with the review of plans

			in the immediate area where the ITC is planned so the details of an alternative to the transit loop can be accurately determined.
14	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Would like to see roundabouts on Turquoise, Carson @ Refugio. Delete possible signal at Willow and Palm? <i>(on page 27, Figure 3-10)</i>	The CE on page 61 in Policy 3.A.5 encourages the use of “roundabouts” as an alternative to adding more traffic signals, and specifically mentions the Sycamore Avenue/Palm Street intersection as a possible “roundabout” location. However, given the very specific physical requirements needed to accommodate a roundabout and the time necessary to perform such an assessment on a given intersection, it may not be appropriate in a broad policy document such as the CE to call out specific additional sites for a roundabout.
15	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	<i>(On page 36 under Sidewalks and Walkways)</i> Mention future plan to put sidewalk from Palm to Transit Center in 2018.	The last sentence in the Sidewalks and Walkways paragraph does state this.
16	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	<i>(On page 36 under the Creekside Trail and Boardwalk section)</i> Should Council consider deleting mention of Boardwalk? Over 10 years no construction.	The City has already prepared detailed plans for this “boardwalk” trail. The term “boardwalk” is used to describe this segment of the trail not because the trail will be made of wood (it will be concrete), but because of the presence of nearby wetlands the trail may need to be cantilevered off the ground over the wetlands, similar to how a “boardwalk” is placed above the ground. This pedestrian connection is sorely needed on a major roadway such as San Pablo.
17	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	<i>(On page 36 under the Informal Trails section)</i> Delete. Mentioning informal trails gives credence to the trails	The intent of the wording in the CE is to document that such informal trails exist, and not to encourage their creation. However, given the potential controversy such trails could generate, it might be appropriate to add wording to the Circulation Element making it clear that the City is not promoting the creation of such trails. Alternatively references to informal trails could be deleted for the Final Circulation Element.

			<p>Page 36 of the document defines Informal Trails as being “identified by the community as points of access, and may or may not occur on City-owned property. In some cases these trails consist of handscape paths through neighborhoods to encourage walkability, and in other cases, they are just a foot trail along the hillsides. Figure 3-12 does not encompass all informal trails.</p> <p>The Council could add clarifying language such as “the City is not promoting the creation of additional footpaths along hillsides” if they desire.</p>
18	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Should we mention the cost of bringing BART to Hercules from the WCCTAC advisory study (<i>Under Policy 4B page 64</i>)?	<p>Adding the projected cost of extending BART is complicated by the fact that the cost varies depending on where the station site is ultimately located as well as the technology used for the BART extension. Any cost figures usually are not included in a long-term document. However a sentence could be added at the end of the first paragraph of Policy 4.B:BART EXTENSION to state “An initial cost assessment included in the High Capacity Transit Study adopted in 2017 by the West Contra Costa Transportation Advisory Committee (WCCTAC) show current costs for a BART extension to Hercules ranging from \$3.6 to \$4.2 Billion to construct versus approximately \$51 million to complete the Regional Intermodal Transportation Center along the existing Amtrak Capitol Corridor Line.”</p>
19	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Transit Center is no longer the vision of Hercules. Should the New Town Center be deleted from discussion (<i>On page 64 under policy 4.B.3</i>)	<p>The CE does not propose any changes to the existing Zoning or Land Use District’s within the City. The New Town Center is currently an existing Zone District and part of the Central Hercules Priority Development Area (PDA) which could potentially have some viability only if a BART type facility were located in Hercules in the very long term and therefore should not be changed at this point.</p>
20	Vice Mayor	Should we mention Lynx and the double decker buses	<p>Page 43 of the CE under the “Lynx.” section already states that three double-decker buses will be added in 2018 to keep up with ridership. The</p>

	Dan Romero	increasing the ridership 40% (On page 64 Policy 4.C.2)	40% ridership increase language varies every year and therefore would lose its context quickly and should not be changed.
21	Vice Mayor Dan Romero	Can we mention working current stores and centers to bring EV charging stations? (On page 67 under Policy 5.B)	Policy 5.B.5b talks about this in the form of charging stations for zero-emission vehicles. The discussion could be expanded to include current City efforts as well as evolving State requirements to include a certain minimum number of EV charging facilities in new developments. However, the only other possible change would be to consider a requirement for more EV parking than the State Green Building standard (which continues to shift every year to require more, whereas this CE is intended to last 22 years and would not be updated as often).
22	Holly Smyth	Page 20, Figure 3-2 Correction Needed	Should correct Figure 3-2 to change the direction of the travel lane arrow to face up on the far right and add page number
23	Holly Smyth	Page 24, Figure 3-6	Should modify to add the 5.5'-8' Parking Strip on the right hand side of the cross section between parking and sidewalk and modify the right of way width to state "it varies"
24	Holly Smyth	Shouldn't the pagination throughout sync with the Current City General Plan which calls out the Circulation Element on pages III-1 to III-27	The pages should be changed to be III-1 to III-77 so they can be inserted into the current City General Plan. Additionally, for ease of printing between the small and large format pages, all large 11x17 maps should be placed at the back of the Circulation Element.
25	Holly Smyth	Throughout the document there is excessive hyphenation occurring and the most egregious ones should be minimized	Agree
26	Holly Smyth	Figure 3-10 should remove the table gridlines for the study intersection list and add a stop	Agree

		at Palm/Willow that is already in place	
27	Holly Smyth	Figure 3-11 Truck Routes on page 33 should remove the Fire Road GIS layer	Agree
28	Holly Smyth	Modify Figure 3-1 Roadway Network to include a Collector road(s) from Hercules Avenue to Railroad Avenue	The Planning Commission recommended since Hercules Avenue is already a Collector designated street to Fawcett that it should continue down Fawcett to Santa Fe and then along Santa Fe to Railroad Avenue. The City Engineer is recommending that instead of this proposal that the Collector street only be added along Santa Fe Avenue from Hercules Avenue to Railroad. This segment should be added in Figure 3-1 and adding into the list of Collector streets on page 23 in the first paragraph.
29	Holly Smyth		4 Pages of additional Traffic-Related Appendices need to be added to show some technical assumptions for reference and will be presented at the Council meeting.
30	Holly Smyth	Consider modifying Policy 1.D.1 on page 57 to include a higher bike parking standard for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to better accommodate the “last mile” and encourage visitors to the residents to visit via bike	The Aventine project had 10% on street bike racks and 20% onsite secured bike storage parking facilities of the total residential unit count which is in a TOD development and this standard should be incorporated into other TOD areas.
	<u>ADDITIONAL ITEMS BROUGHT UP DURING THE 2/13/2018 CITY COUNCIL MEETING (shown in blue text below and above, with red bold items recommended to be incorporated into changes in the document)</u>		
31	Myrna DeVera & Rolland Esquivias	Explain the difference between the Planning Commission Recommendation versus the City Engineer recommendation regarding adding a “Collector”	More people actually use Santa Fe all the way from Hercules to Railroad Avenue as a route already and has one less stop sign then the other route and therefore makes better since as a Collector designation.

		street down Fawcett to Sante Fe versus Sante Fe all the way from Hercules Avenue	Follow item 28 above.
32	Rolland Esquivias	Would sidewalk to Pinole along San Pablo be included in the Circulation Element	There is an existing sidewalk on the northside of San Pablo Avenue between Hercules Avenue and the Pinole Bridge that splits off to a crossing towards the Pinole Senior Center. The existing bridge has narrow walkways on both sides of the bridge currently which there is not enough room currently to accommodate ADA sideways until the structure is replaced. Should add “potential sidewalk yellow highlighting” to Figure 3-12 Pedestrian Facilities map along San Pablo from Hercules Avenue to the bridge on the southside of the street. As to timing, we would not consider installing until the bridge is rebuilt by Pinole.
33	Gerard Boulanger	What is the official definition of a Truck Route	It is a network of Roadways that is the preferred route that trucks should travel for freight above certain weights. In Hercules’ case, it generally includes all the arterial roadways.
34	Gerard Boulanger	Why do we mention something may be changed in the future in reference to Figure 3-9 Waterfront Map but not part of the Circulation Element? Another map mentions potential litigation on the map, why?	We wanted to make sure all Circulation Related maps are discuss or shown in the element so that the public know what exists. The Waterfront Masterplan cannot be amended by the Circulation Element alone; and must be agreed to by the property owner and the City and passed via Ordinance. Therefore, the map was included in the document and text noted on page 20 that “the actual adopted map is incorporated by reference” only placed in the document and should stay as is currently listed The adopted Refugio Creek Watershed Vision Plan shows a connection to the Upper Watershed Loop Trail that would have normally showed a connection point in the pedestrian map in Figure 3-12 in the Circulation Element. In an effort to be transparent and due to existing litigation, staff wanted to be up front that this was an area with an issue of concern, but could have been shown as a proposed trail as it is already in an adopted Plan.

35	Dan Romero	Asked that the asterisk footnote be removed from Figure 3-12. Pedestrian Facilities Map .	See response above in item #34.
36	Dan Romero	Why didn't the Council have the supporting documents of the Existing Circulation Element, the 1991 Economic Element, and the Refugio Creek Watershed Plan?	<p>The existing 28-page Circulation Element was provided as an attachment to the 12/18/2017 Planning Commission meeting and a link was also provided as Attachment #5 of the Circulation Element item in the 2/13/2018 City Council packet.</p> <p>The main text of the new Circulation Element is 77 pages with technical appendices/backup bringing the document under 400 pages so that it is all available to the public.</p> <p>The 1991 Economic Element is part of the existing General Plan which is available on the web, but was not provided as a separate link attachment as it's only connection with the Circulation Element is the policy that traffic flow will be verified on a regular bases.</p> <p>City Manager Biggs sent out electronic versions of the Refugio Creek Watershed Plan to Council 2/14/2018 after the meeting for reference. The document was not separately called out in a link previously to the Planning Commission or the City Council, but it has been available on the City website since before the Circulation Element process started and was adopted by City Council Resolution 10-022 on February 9, 2010.</p>
37	Dan Romero	The old Circulation Element never talked about Pedestrian trails, why does the new element	State law requires cities to addresses Complete Streets policy now which includes all travel modes including walking.
38	Dan Romero	Concerned about Emergency Access proposed off the top of Refugio Valley Road seems too steep to accommodate out to Goat Road then to Alhambra to	Planning Commission brought up this alternative to add as a secondary evacuation route due to the recent Santa Rosa fires. City Manager Biggs consulted with Police and Fire about the alternative as a potential secondary alternative route.

		the east out not traversable. Easier access off Turquoise Avenue off Dean Court which is about 200 yards may make better since on a temporary paved EVA	EVA from Turquoise Avenue to Dean Court in the City of Pinole is feasible and is about 350' distance over a City owned area and should be added as a potential secondary evacuation route on Figure 3-15. As a footnote, access onto Dean Court would take the agreement by the City of Pinole to implement.
39	Dan Romero	Information at Planning Commission stated the connection at Henry Road through Country Run, which is not the case.	Staff misstated in the Planning Commission powerpoint presentation that the Henry EVA connection is through Country Run. However, Figure 3-15 shows the proper connection point connecting adjacent to Glenwood and therefore nothing in the Element needs to be modified in the text or map in the Circulation Element.
40	Dan Romero	Should traffic calming like a round about be added to Hercules Avenue	Policy 3.A.5 already discusses Roundabout being considered and Policy 3.A.3 discusses Traffic Calming which will be considered as specific problems or projects are evaluated.
41	Dan Romero	Circulation Element Update seems to have morphed into something bigger like a General Plan improvement	<p>The element did not incorporate any updates to any Land Use / Zoning but reflects existing Land Use / Zoning as updates to Land Use would have been much more costly and required much more extensive environmental review documents such as an Environmental Impact Report.</p> <p>The current format of the Circulation Element fits into current State law framework, complete streets, and required consistency with existing other sections of the existing General Plan, and highlighting existing policies as they relate to the circulation element.</p> <p>Complete Streets requires that all modes of travel and connectivity are looked at for vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, buses, and other transit modes. As community meetings were being held, participants were identifying informal trails that they use to better connect to transit all over town.</p> <p>Additionally, the cross-sections brought into the element were meant to eliminate current inconsistencies between the Central Hercules Plan (that</p>

			will pre-empt this document's cross-sections), Public Works standards, and the existing built roadway network.
42	Dan Romero	When do we talk about the future new off-ramp shown off Hwy 80 onto Sycamore	The most recent County Transportation Plan includes this as an option, however it is not currently funded. This addition would greatly reduce vehicle miles travelled and would probably not require Willow hook ramps be relocated due to their close proximity to meet Caltrans off-set standards.
43	Dan Romero	Should we delete the Willow Avenue loop ramp relocation project	The Willow ramp relocation project was carried over from existing approved Environmental Impact Reports. Should the Council want to remove these improvements, the Circulation Element traffic can meet the City standards at build out so long as an additional traffic thru lane is added onto north-east bound San Pablo Avenue as it approaches Sycamore Avenue. Staff is not recommending that this be removed, as it may be required in order to get a new off-ramp off Highway 80 directly onto Sycamore Avenue. However, if Caltrans would not require the relocation as part of this project, it might make sense to remove.
44	Dan Romero	Additional lanes needed on Sycamore	Prior Environmental Documents and traffic project lists, and traffic analysis have showed additional lanes being installed on Sycamore between Willow and San Pablo. The Updated Circulation Element continues to show these same improvements still being needed and therefore should not change.
45	Chris Kelley	Are the list of traffic calming limited to just the list shown in the element, could it include traffic circles and roundabout??	No it is not limited. Should modify policy 3.A.3 Traffic Calming to include "and similar devices" to clarify that the list is not finite.
46	Chris Kelley	Page 63 talks about a 5% job/commute trips goal, how does that work if we don't have many jobs in town?	The idea is that part of the "trip" could be by bike to say the transit center and then take a bus or any combination of travel modes that includes the use of a bike.

47	Chris Kelley	Suggest that roundabout always be evaluated with new signalization	Caltrans standards now requires that “alternative” traffic controls other than signalization be evaluated before installing new devices. Policy 3.A.5 Roundabouts is already included in the draft document.
48	Chris Kelley	What does it mean to remove the pedestrian cross-walk	The northeast leg of the San Pablo & Sycamore Avenue crosswalk next to the approved Safeway is proposed for removal.
49	Chris Kelley	Route C-3 now has a 30 minute headway as of a month ago	Change the headway from one hour to 30-minute headway on page 43 under the Route C3 discussion.
50	Chris Kelley	What will the traffic impact fees be used for	Developers are required to pay their proportionate share towards their impacts to the Circulation system. Generally, the fees go towards projects listed in Table 5-1 on pages 74 & 75.
51	Chris Kelley	The bike lane down Sycamore Avenue disappears as you go from Civic towards the Highway overcrossing, can it be improved over time	There City recently applied for grant funding to cut a pedestrian/ bicycle path under the railroad structure that is needed prior to additional connectivity being added down this section. This cut/retaining wall project is included in the Project improvement list on page 75. Additionally, Figure 3-13 shows a future proposed Mutli-Use path from Refugio Valley Road to San Pablo along Sycamore on the northside of the roadway and a Class III on the south side of the roadway. No changes additional changes recommended.