

**PLANNING COMMISSION
STAFF REPORT**

Subject: Consider and Provide Recommendations to the Town Council on the Draft General Plan Mobility Element Update

Initiated by: Jessica Morriss, Transportation Planner
Mark Wardlaw, Community Development Director
Ray Jarvis, Director of Public Works

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this staff report is for the Planning Commission to consider and provide recommendations to the Town Council on the Town of Mammoth Lakes Draft General Plan Mobility Element.

The Mobility Element, once adopted, will serve as an update to the existing Circulation Element of the Town's 2007 General Plan, representing an expanded and more comprehensive approach to multimodal transportation planning and infrastructure for the Town.

The Draft Element has been developed over the last approximately two years based on extensive research, technical analysis, and public input. The Draft Element was released for public review on October 10, 2011 and was presented to Town Commissions as follows:

- Planning Commission: Wednesday, November 9, 2011
- Mobility Commission: Tuesday, November 15, 2011
- Recreation Commission: Thursday, November 17, 2011
- Airport Commission: Tuesday, November 22, 2011

Public comments on the Draft Element can be submitted to staff until December 16, 2011.

ANALYSIS/DISCUSSION

Purpose of the Mobility Element

The Mobility Element, once adopted, will serve as the community's comprehensive transportation plan. The Mobility Element, establishes the goals, policies, actions, and infrastructure necessary to achieve a progressive

and complete multimodal transportation system that serves the needs of all users by implementing “feet-first,” “complete streets,” smart-growth, and context-sensitive design principles.

The Mobility Element will inform other Town planning and programming documents such as the Public Facilities Finance Plan (PFFP) and the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), future development application processes, and transportation-related master plans for trails, bikeways, transit, and sidewalks, among others.

As described in the November 9, 2011 Planning Commission Staff Report, the Draft Element outlines the structure of the Town’s existing and future multimodal transportation system by mode (vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, transit) and also includes information about various transportation-related topics (parking, transportation demand management, regional/interregional transportation). The draft document includes a detailed figure for each mode that illustrates existing and recommended future facilities, as well as goals, policies, and actions to achieve mobility objectives.

Draft Mobility Element Comments

During the public review period, Town staff presented the Draft Mobility Element to the Planning, Mobility, Recreation, and Airport Commissions for their consideration. At the November 9th Planning Commission meeting, the Commission provided initial comments on the Draft Element. These comments, as well as comments from the other Town Commissions and the public that have been received thus far, are provided in the tracking table in Attachment 2. Initial responses from staff for each comment are also included in the tracking table, indicating how each comment will be addressed, if necessary, when preparing the final Draft Element.

In general, the comments that have been received from the Commissions and public are minor in nature and there was support from the other Town Commissions for the draft document to be brought forward to the Planning Commission for further consideration and recommendations at their meeting today.

In its discussion at today’s meeting, the Planning Commission may wish to consider the broad range of goals, policies, and actions in the Draft Element and whether they are consistent with and advance land use objectives and recent/current planning initiatives such as Neighborhood District Planning; the Zoning Code update; future facilities planning and programming; and if the document appropriately addresses the complete multimodal transportation system, consistent with other Elements of the General Plan.

Once Planning Commission direction has been received, staff will revise the draft document to address comments as necessary. The final Draft Element

will then be brought to the Town Council for consideration; staff will also seek direction from the Council regarding funding for necessary CEQA review.

Comments from all parties are due no later than December 16, 2011 at 5:00 pm and can be directed to Jessica Morriss, Associate Transportation Planner, at Jmorriss@ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us or (760) 934-8989 ext. 225.

All documents can be found on the Town's website at the following web address: <http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=425> and via the web links provided below. The document can also be reviewed at the Town offices at 437 Old Mammoth Road, Suite R.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

1. Recommend, with any modifications, the Draft General Plan Mobility Element and forward to the Town Council for consideration.
2. Do not recommend the Draft General Plan Mobility Element and do not forward to the Town Council for consideration.

VISION CONSIDERATIONS

The Draft Mobility Element is consistent with the goals and policies of the General Plan, emphasizing "feet-first" transportation and the "triple-bottom-line."

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Preparation of the Draft Mobility Element was identified in the Community Development and Public Works FY 2011/2012 work program. Additional funding is provided through the Mono County Local Transportation Commission. Funding for CEQA review has not yet been identified.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

An environmental review of the Draft Element will be required in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) prior to adoption. Funding for CEQA review has not yet been identified.

LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

None.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission choose Option 1 and recommend, with any modifications, the Draft General Plan Mobility Element and forward to the Town Council for consideration.

Attachments:

1. Draft Mobility Element (provided previously)

2. Public Comment Tracking Table

Draft Mobility Element Web Links (<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=425>)

Draft Mobility Element

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2089>

Draft Mobility Element Chapter 3 Graphics

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2098>

Goals, Policies, and Actions Tracking Table

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2128>

Appendices

Appendix A: Community Engagement Materials and Public Comments

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2095>

Appendix B: Promotion and Advertising

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2090>

Appendix C: General Plan Guidelines: Complete Streets and Circulation Element

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2091>

Appendix D: Typical Cross-section Graphics

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2092>

Appendix E: Town Traffic Model

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2093>

Appendix F: Implementation Table

<http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/DocumentView.aspx?DID=2097>

Attachment 1

(Materials provided previously)

Attachment 2

(Public Comments)



Town of Mammoth Lakes
 Community Development Department
 P.O. Box 1609, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

Introduction:

The following comments have been received from the public and/or Town Commissions during the public review period for the Town of Mammoth Lakes Draft General Plan Mobility Element.

Draft General Plan Mobility Element	
Item	Staff note
General	
1. Page 2-12: Update the Trail System Master Plan section to reflect adoption in October 2011. (Jo Bacon, citizen; Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	1. Staff will correct the Background section of the Draft Element to reflect the correct adoption date of the Trail System Master Plan.
2. Page 2-13: Mono County Regional Transportation Plan section needs to differentiate between Mono County Local Transportation Commission, who adopts the RTP, and then those portions that Mono County uses as their internal planning documents. (Jo Bacon, citizen)	2. Staff will revise the Background section of the Draft Element to provide clarification regarding the Mono County Regional Transportation Plan.
3. Page 2-14: Correct name is RecStrats Implementation Strategy when referring to what was adopted in October 2011. (Jo Bacon, citizen)	3. Staff will revise this section to include discussion of both RecStrats and the RecStrats Implementation Strategy.
4. Page 2-15: Airport Layout Plan Update is not likely to be approved in 2011, due to remaining steps that need to be accomplished. (Jo Bacon, citizen)	4. Staff will correct the Background Section of the Draft Element to reflect the anticipated approval of the Airport Layout Plan.
5. Because critical mass in the North Village is insufficient at this time, transportation to and from the North Village should be improved. (Madeline Brown, Planning Commission)	5. Staff will add language to emphasize the North Village as a transportation hub and improvements that should be incorporated to provide additional connectivity in and around this area.
6. The topography in Mammoth creates transportation challenges and should be addressed more clearly. (Madeline Brown, Planning Commission)	6. The Setting and Context section (Page 2-1/2) of the Draft Element briefly describes the challenges associated with implementing transportation infrastructure due to the varied topography of Mammoth Lakes. Staff will add additional information to the goals, policies, and actions contained

	in the complete streets section to more clearly address topographical challenges, particularly with regard to design standards for sidewalks, paths, and bicycle facilities.
7. Change references to “The North Village” to “North Village” (John Verueuk, Mobility Commission)	7. Staff will revise as suggested.
8. Change labels on graphics to “Horseshoe Lake,” rather than “Lake Horseshoe” (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	8. Staff will revise as suggested.
9. Change labels on graphics to “Community Center and Park,” rather than “Community Center.” (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	9. Staff will revise as suggested.
10. Page 2-3: Has the name of the Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) been changed? (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	10. No. At this time the name of the future Public Facilities Financing Plan (PFFP) has not changed; however, the Committee established to assist with the preparation of the PFFP has been renamed the “Capital Financing Committee.”
11. Page 2-4: Note that Highway 203 provides access to other recreation destinations as well as Mammoth Mountain Ski Area. (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	11. Staff will revise as suggested.
12. Page 2-7: Add Caltrans as a partner in working with the Town, Mammoth Mountain Ski Area, and ESTA. (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	12. Staff will revise as suggested.
13. Consider adding a page referencing the various mobility planning documents and their date of approval or acceptance, and noting that they are “incorporated by reference” in the Mobility Element. State that each may be amended or updated separately, with the most recent version replacing the previous. This will help all of us keep track of these documents. (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	13. Staff will include a table in the Background section of the Draft Element to summarize the relationship between the Element and other transportation related documents and their timelines for updates (if applicable).
14. Is the Draft Element consistent with other Town planning documents? (Sean Turner, Recreation Commission)	14. Yes, the Draft Element is consistent with and advances the goals and objectives of other Town work efforts, studies, and planning and policy documents. Pages 2-7 through 2-15 describe the relationship of the Draft Element to other Town planning documents, including the General Plan, Neighborhood District Plans, Trail System Master Plan, transit plans, RecStrats Implementation Strategy, etc.
15. Does the Draft Element include specific standards (design) for transportation facilities (sidewalks, paths, bike lanes,	15. In general, no. The Draft Element describes general design standards and guidelines for facilities (Table 3-1 – Page 3-

<p>etc.)? (Sean Turner, Recreation Commission)</p>	<p>20/21; Table 3-2 – Page 3-42), but does not include specific engineering design standards, which are included in the Public Works Standards. Appendix D includes concept cross-sections, including potential future cross-sections for Main Street and Old Mammoth Road, which may guide future updates to the Public Works Standards. Additionally, the Draft Element includes a number of goals, policies, and actions intended to guide future updates of the Public Works Standards to incorporate updated parking and safety strategies.</p>
<p>16. Are off-road motorized recreational vehicles (ATVs, snowmobiles, dirt bikes, etc.) addressed in the Draft Element? (Bill Sauser, Recreation Commission)</p>	<p>16. In general, the Draft Element does not include information regarding travel using off-road motorized recreational vehicles since much of this activity occurs outside of the Town's Urban Growth Boundary and is not part of the typical circulation system; however staging areas, which serve recreation nodes and trail heads are depicted in Figures 3-1 through 3-5. Other planning processes, such as the Trail System Master Plan, RecStrats Implementation Strategy, and the ongoing Shady Rest Motorized Staging Area Planning Project describe these types of uses and staging for these uses in more detail.</p>
<p>17. Does the Draft Element describe transportation to and from recreation nodes? (Bill Sauser, Recreation Commission)</p>	<p>17. Yes. The Draft Element describes multimodal transportation and recommends infrastructure that is intended to serve all types of nodes in Mammoth Lakes (recreation, commercial, employment, etc.), although not all recreation nodes are discussed. Additionally, staging areas, which serve recreation nodes and trail heads are depicted in Figures 3-1 through 3-5.</p>
<p>Complete Streets</p>	
<p>18. Page 1-2: Since Complete Streets are so important to our future, I believe that the definition should be expanded. Below is suggested language, which was excerpted from http://www.completestreets.org/complete-streets-fundamentals/complete-streets-faq/: "Complete Streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users. Pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities</p>	<p>18. Staff will incorporate the suggested definition into the Introduction and Complete Streets sections of the Draft Element as necessary.</p>

<p>must be able to safely move along and across a complete street. A complete street may include: sidewalks, bike lanes (or wide paved shoulders), special bus lanes, comfortable and accessible public transportation stops, frequent and safe crossing opportunities, median islands, accessible pedestrian signals, curb extensions, narrower travel lanes, roundabouts, and more.” (Jo Bacon, citizen)</p>	
<p>19. Page 3-1: Provide captions for photos. (Elizabeth Tenney, Planning Commission)</p>	<p>19. Staff will provide photo captions.</p>
<p>20. What are the criteria for a “constrained” street? (Sharon Clark, Planning Commission)</p>	<p>20. In general, a “constrained” street refers to a street that is of substandard pavement and right-of-way width and was designed for low-volume residential uses. (Page 3-21). Streets in some of Mammoth Lakes’ older neighborhoods, such as Sierra Valley and Old Mammoth, contain constrained streets.</p>
<p>Vehicle</p>	
<p>21. Page 3-16: The use restrictions for the Waterford Connector (e.g. emergency access use vs. daily traffic use) should be more clearly explained (Elizabeth Tenney, Planning Commission; Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)</p>	<p>21. Staff will add additional information to the Vehicle section of the Draft Element regarding use restrictions for the Waterford Connector (Page 3-16). The Waterford Connector will not be constructed to support daily vehicle use; however, it will be accessible in emergency situations by both the public and emergency vehicles. The Waterford connector will be available for daily use by pedestrians and bicyclists.</p>
<p>22. Consider adding additional information about emergency access routes into and out of town, as well as other emergency access improvement opportunities. (Elizabeth Tenney, Planning Commission)</p>	<p>22. Staff will add additional information to the Vehicle section of the Draft Element regarding emergency access/evacuation routes and emergency access in town.</p>
<p>Pedestrian</p>	
<p>23. Providing sidewalks and clearing them of snow should be a priority. Geothermal heating of sidewalks should be considered more seriously. (Madeline Brown, Planning Commission)</p>	<p>23. Comment noted. The Pedestrian section of the Draft Element describes the need for improved pedestrian facilities and access. Key pedestrian routes (Page 3-30) are designated in Figure 3-3 and are proposed to receive priority for snow removal. Staff will add language to Action M.8.1.2. to include snow removal priorities in the Sidewalk Master Plan update. Additionally, the policies and actions included under Goal M.4 (Pages 3-12/13) establish objectives for improved snow and ice management and emphasize exploration of</p>

	alternate snow removal technologies, including geothermal.
24. The Town should consider requiring private property owners whose property fronts on a sidewalk to clear the sidewalk. (Sharon Clark, Planning Commission)	24. The Draft Element emphasizes the creation and/or expansion of assessment districts to fund snow removal and other maintenance of sidewalks and infrastructure (Action M.4.1.2; Policy M.8.2; Action M.8.2.1.); however, Staff will research this suggestion.
Bicycle	
25. Page 3-37 & 38: Add which type of Class (I,II,III) bikeway is represented in each photo to the caption, for clarification. Also consider moving the photo on 3-37 to the bottom right, next to the Class 1 definition. (Jo Bacon, citizen)	25. Staff will add clarifications to the photo captions in the Bicycle section of the Draft Element.
Transit	
26. Figure 3-5: Why does the existing transit route through the Sierra Valley only run between Meridian and Dorrance on Manzanita and not the full length of Manzanita? (Sharon Clark, Planning Commission)	26. The existing transit routes in Sierra Valley are based on existing ridership demand. Currently, more ridership demand exists on Lupin Street. It is important to note that Figure 3-5 depicts existing transit routes, which will generally not change; however minor changes to routes and/or stops may be made on an annual basis to address changes in demand.
27. Suggestion that all existing transit stops be depicted on graphics, rather than just "major transit stops." (Eric Wasserman, Mobility Commission)	27. Staff will add all existing transit stops to the graphics; however, "major transit stops" will still be depicted separately.
28. Page 2-13: Should ESTA's Short Range Transit Plan be included in this section? Does it address Town transit services? (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	28. The ESTA Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) does include information about Town transit services provided by ESTA. Staff will revise the Background section of the Draft Element to include information about the ESTA SRTP and its relationship to Town transit.
29. Figure 3-5: Revise the transit route on Minaret Road between Chateau Road and Old Mammoth Road to a "year round" route. (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	29. Staff will revise as suggested.
30. Figure 3-5: Is the future transit route extension on Main Street to the Meridian Boulevard proposed roundabout recommended by ESTA. (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	30. This future transit route depicted in Figure 3-5 is meant to represent potential future transit service to the Mammoth Yosemite Airport. The graphic will be revised to show the future route continuing east on Highway 203, rather than ending at Meridian

	Boulevard.
31. Page 3-50, Action M.12.1.1 "Develop short and long-range transit plans that identify community transit needs and update regularly." Are these plans developed by the Town or ESTA and could they be part of ESTA's Short Range Transit Plan (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)	31. Staff will revise this Action item to add clarity. The Town, ESTA, and Mammoth Mountain Ski Area work together to regularly update transit service plans to address annual needs, which are typically not formal documents. The ESTA short-range transit plan is a formal document that includes planning information for Town transit service, but does not include detailed information about Mammoth Mountain Ski Area transit service.
32. Identify current transit options at airport: public-private rental car agreements with Hertz and Enterprise Rent-A-Car, lodging shuttles, and taxis. (Airport Commission)	32. Staff will add additional information to the Transit section of the Draft Element to describe current and potential future transportation services at Mammoth Yosemite Airport.
33. The private sector should "bear the burden" of transit to the airport, but the option should remain open in the future for public transit options to be provided. (Airport Commission)	33. Staff will add additional information to the Transit section of the Draft Element to describe current and potential future transportation services at Mammoth Yosemite Airport.
34. Discuss options for future transit service from the Mammoth Yosemite Airport to areas in Mono and Inyo County (e.g. Bishop, June Lake, etc.) (Airport Commission)	34. Staff will add language expressing the potential for future transit service to and from Mammoth Yosemite Airport to other communities in Mono and/or Inyo County.
35. Consider the potential for implementing express transit routes to the North Village, Main Lodge, and Canyon Lodge for a fee. The express transit could potentially utilize the Tavern Road parking lot. (Madeline Brown, Planning Commission)	35. Action M.12.1.2. (Page 3-51) states that the Town will work with other agencies and organizations to explore implementation of rapid transit buses on key corridors or to key destinations. Staff will add additional language to the Transit section to describe rapid transit bus opportunities and options.
Parking	
36. Page 3-54: We seem to again be ignoring the issue of adequate parking for recreational vehicles, oversized vehicles and trailers. This is a demand we are not meeting, and this section doesn't even address the issue. (Jo Bacon, citizen)	36. Staff will revise the Parking section of the Draft Element to include additional information and goals, policies, and actions regarding accommodating oversize vehicles in residential and commercial areas, including more efficient parking area design.
37. Parking in the North Village is insufficient. A parking structure should be provided. (Madeline Brown, Planning Commission)	37. Staff will revise the Parking section of the Draft Element to include additional information about parking in the North Village, including potential goals, policies, actions.

<p>38. Supports the concept of paid parking (charging for parking), which should be considered as a strategy to help spread the cost of parking from the Town and businesses to the consumer. (Rhonda Duggan, Planning Commission)</p>	<p>38. Comment noted. Policy M.14.3. (Page 3-57) describes the use of metered or paid parking. Staff will add additional information to the Parking section of the Draft Element to describe paid parking opportunities and options.</p>
<p>39. Supports parking policies that encourage efficiency. Parking is expensive and we currently dedicate too many resources to parking. (Rhonda Duggan, Planning Commission)</p>	<p>39. Comment noted.</p>
<p>40. Supports suggestion of implementing paid parking in certain circumstances. (Jay Deinken, Planning Commission)</p>	<p>40. Comment noted.</p>
<p>41. What is the difference between “shared parking” and “internal capture”? Can a footnote be added to explain these two terms? (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)</p>	<p>41. Staff will revise the Parking section of the Draft Element to include more information/clarification about these parking strategies. Internal capture refers to the decrease in parking demand for a mixed use project because trips are captured on-site between uses, not requiring additional parking for each use. Shared parking is similar, but refers to either the decrease in parking demand for mixed use projects because the uses have different peak parking demands or it can refer to the sharing of physical parking spaces by adjacent or nearby properties/businesses.</p>
<p>42. Page 3-57, Policy M.14.4: Please explain the concept of allowing developers to offer the purchase of parking spaces separately from a unit. Is this successful in other places? (Sandy Hogan, Mobility Commission)</p>	<p>42. Staff will add information to the Parking section about this parking strategy. The concept is called “unbundling” and is a successful strategy for improving parking efficiency and reducing housing costs by separating the costs of housing from parking (i.e. allowing consumers to purchase the parking the need rather than including it in the cost of the building). This concept also helps to show the true costs associated with parking.</p>