

**Date:** April 26, 2022

**To:** Growth Management Citizens Committee (and members of the public)

**From:** Steve Linke, Traffic & Mobility Commission Vice-Chair and Growth Management Citizens Committee primary member

**Subject:** April 28, 2022 Growth Management Citizens Committee Meeting written comments

Given time limitations of large committee meetings like ours, this communication is intended to provide some recommendations and questions/suggested future topics. Following those, I provide some background, history, and concerns that put them into context. I will detail additional concerns and consequences in communications for future meetings.

## **Recommendations and questions/suggested future topics**

**Recommendation:** Our committee should ensure that validated measurement methods and Growth Management Plan (GMP) performance standards that reflect reality are locked down for all public facilities—not methods that can be continually tweaked to artificially achieve success.

**Recommendation:** Exemption of any public facilities from a GMP performance standard should require a proportional alternative mitigation plan with identified funding and a timeline—not simple abandonment.

**Recommendation:** If we move away from the “performance standard” system, any new system should be overtly mandatory and not include soft language that implies voluntary compliance.

**Recommendation:** Impact fees/programs (e.g., traffic impact), housing fees, and other developer costs, like review and permitting fees, have been allowed to sit without meaningful updates for extended periods of time. These should be considered globally with the GMP and updated regularly to reflect current needs and costs.

**Question or suggested future topic:** The new state laws that prevent residential development moratoria have a sunset clause, and they do not seemingly prevent commercial development moratoria. They also continue to allow various impact fees. How can these be used to maximize GMP requirements?

**Question or suggested future topic:** Please explain the protocol staff uses to determine a “nexus” between a development project and its obligation to fund a public facility improvement, as well as the method used to calculate its “proportional funding.”

**Question or suggested future topic:** Given the fact that the vast majority of remaining development in Carlsbad will be “in-fill” (rather than “vacant land”), and the fact that in-fill projects are largely being exempted from having to conduct GMP and CEQA studies—combined with the alleged difficulty in making a funding “nexus”—what are the prospects of the funding of the various public facilities by future development, and how can GMP requirements be maximized?

## Background

One of the eleven public facilities included in the GMP is **circulation** (also known as traffic, transportation, streets, or mobility), which currently includes vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle, and transit modes of travel. I have been studying this topic for over a decade, and I have spent the last three years on the Traffic & Mobility Commission intent on reforming the transportation review process in Carlsbad. I also have reviewed the GMP and CEQA transportation portions of all development applications and City projects over the past three years. My comments here are focused on transportation, but the concepts may apply more generally to other facilities, as well.

The **performance measure** for circulation is called **level of service** (LOS). Generally, LOS is reported for each street segment (facility) on a scale of “A” through “F”—calculated from the volume of vehicles relative to the capacity of the street, or the average length of time it takes vehicles to traverse an intersection or street corridor—the worse the congestion, the lower the grade. An LOS grade of “D” during peak hours is required to achieve the minimum GMP **performance standard**.

The way the GMP is supposed to work for circulation is that, when a development project is proposed, a **transportation impact study** predicts the **direct** impacts the project will have on the LOS of nearby street/mobility facilities. The approval of the project is then supposed to be **conditioned** upon funding any improvements necessary to maintain the minimum LOS standard, such as street widening, intersection improvements, etc.

In addition, the City is required by the GMP to conduct its own **annual** LOS assessments (the **Traffic Monitoring Program**) to prospectively identify emerging problems that arise due to the **cumulative, indirect** impacts of developments on the overall citywide mobility network. These results are supposed to be used to add additional mobility projects and the associated costs to the City’s Traffic Impact Fee (TIF) Program, which is intertwined with the GMP. A separate **traffic impact fee** is then charged to all developers based on the type of development (residential vs. commercial) and the number of vehicle trips they generate, in order to fund the TIF Program projects to help maintain the minimum GMP standard citywide.

Further, if annual monitoring reveals a facility that is already **deficient** (fails to meet the minimum GMP standard of LOS “D”), then there is supposed to be a **moratorium** on all development in the corresponding zone until a mobility project that will address the deficiency is identified and has an approved plan, funding, and timeline.

## Troubled history of Carlsbad’s vehicle LOS performance standard

Back in 1988, when the GMP was first being implemented, a group of transportation experts developed guidelines for Carlsbad to calculate vehicle LOS. The guidelines were derived from the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), the gold standard reference for transportation engineers based on decades of research and validation, with additional tuning to Carlsbad’s suburban streets. In 1989, Carlsbad’s “Citizens Committee to Study Growth,” an early predecessor to our committee, reviewed and recommended those guidelines.

Unfortunately, staff ignored the recommendation of the citizens committee and never used the validated vehicle LOS guidelines. Instead, they created their own custom methods that included exaggerated capacities for all of Carlsbad's streets and intersections, and which vastly under-estimated congestion.<sup>1</sup>

Consultants included a disclaimer in their first several annual traffic monitoring reports from 1989 into the early 1990s, pointing out the severe limitations of the methods. In 1993-94 and 2000, traffic consultants suggested reducing the exaggerated capacities or using an HCM-based method to get more accurate results. In 2011, I also presented extensive data at public meetings demonstrating the inaccuracy of the methods. In spite of all of this, staff continued to use their inaccurate methods through 2018 when presenting traffic data to the traffic commission and council.

The 2015 General Plan Update (GPU) required a switch to valid vehicle LOS methods based on the HCM, and multiple traffic consultants have now re-confirmed that Carlsbad's old vehicle LOS methods had not reflected reality by under-estimating congestion. After avoiding required vehicle LOS monitoring for a few years, a valid HCM-based method was finally established in 2018 and phased in slowly over the next few years.

Not surprisingly, we went from all street facilities meeting the minimum GMP performance standard (LOS "A" through "D") with the old Carlsbad methods to having 30+ street facilities identified as GMP-deficient (LOS "E" or "F") with the valid method—a reality that drivers see every day during peak hours. These deficiencies actually started accumulating back around 2008 and really started accelerating around 2012.

Funding for street projects and/or alternative strategies to address these emerging deficiencies could have been secured by adding them to the TIF Program. However, the inaccurate LOS methods masked the deficiencies, and there was a failure to regularly update the TIF project list—despite a requirement in the Municipal Code, and despite previous warnings by council that it would unduly burden future taxpayers with the impacts of developments. I will address this topic more in the future.

The staff report for Thursday's meeting claims that the circulation system is meeting the GMP performance standard (page 5), but that is extremely misleading. The only way it is being met is because the City Council has "**exempted**" those 30+ street facilities from having to meet the performance standard as each deficiency is reported to them. The adoption of the exemption process effectively means that **there is no longer any GMP vehicle LOS performance standard**.

## **Troubled history of the pedestrian, bicycle, and transit LOS standards**

The 2015 GPU also introduced a new system to measure LOS for pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel on streets newly prioritized for those modes—called multimodal level of service (MMLOS). Vehicle LOS tends to degrade over time as growth occurs and vehicle volumes increase, allowing anticipation of the

---

<sup>1</sup> For those curious and adventurous enough to delve deep into the weeds on this topic, see my 7/9/2019 letter to the City Council at [tinyurl.com/yckpt9k9](https://tinyurl.com/yckpt9k9).

need for developers and/or the City to fund improvement projects to increase street/turn lane capacity over time. In contrast, MMLOS is determined from a point system based on **amenities** or **quality** (e.g., sidewalk width, buffers for bike lanes, bus stop benches, safety lighting, etc.)—regardless of whether there are any changes in the numbers of users.

The unintended consequence of this approach is that all pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facility GMP deficiencies across the city will suddenly pop into existence immediately upon the first annual monitoring. And, as the staff report states: “...development cannot be required to pay for existing deficiencies.” Therefore, the city itself would be on the hook to fund all projects to achieve the minimum GMP standards all at once.

I pointed out this fatal flaw in the approach in conversations and letters with staff during the public review period leading up to the 2015 GPU, but I was assured it would work. It did not. It has been over six years since adoption of the GPU that added a requirement for MMLOS monitoring, but no such monitoring has been included in any GMP annual reports. The City even claimed recently that it was never their intent to maintain LOS “D” as part of monitoring, even though that intent seems very clear in the GPU and its public review.

Although there has been no annual city monitoring, preliminary MMLOS point systems have been applied to development applications for the last few years. However, similar to the old vehicle LOS methods, they are largely designed not to fail, and they have been modified multiple times without public review. One example is that the transit LOS point system was modified to award the minimum 60 points necessary to achieve LOS “D” simply based on the City’s adoption of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) ordinance, even though that ordinance does little to nothing to improve transit conditions. It is simply a workaround to get a passing grade to meet the minimum GMP performance standard.

The outcome of all this is that few pedestrian and transit upgrades have been funded by developers, except a few limited sidewalk gap closures and bus stop benches, and no bicycle upgrades have been funded. Staff also has added that a “nexus” cannot be established for the developments to fund such projects in most cases, but there has been no explanation on how staff makes their nexus determinations or how “proportional funding” is determined.

The Traffic & Mobility Commission has been working with staff on the MMLOS system for the last couple of years, and it might be addressed again at our commission meeting next week, but the outcome is uncertain.



Imagine  
Carlsbad

## CARLSBAD'S NEW CITY HALL / CIVIC CENTER

Jan 1 2021

### Geo-Centric or Historic Heart

Ask pretty much anyone, they will say ***Carlsbad is a very nice place***. People from other areas usually say “you are fortunate if Carlsbad is where you call home. To continue that status the City Council now has a major question needing to be answered. ***That question is where to place our new and final City Hall and how to also make it a Civic Center.*** Not an easy decision so we ask that the following input be considered. We all know the City has been defined on paper as having four different zip code quadrants separated by our two largest roadways. It is now defined by four voting districts mostly cutting east to west. ***We also know that the major residential areas are positioned north and south generally separated by the airport and its influence on adjacent land uses.*** We know that the vast majority of Carlsbad was laid out and built under the land planning model of “***suburban-ization***” This doctrine came about in the early 1950s. It's where all different land uses are separated in their own areas. This separation was meant to reduce the possible conflicts between different uses which had been somewhat common up to that time. This separation requires one additional element that would make it possible for this new form of town planning. It requires a full network of roadways for the automobile to tie all areas together into a workable land use fabric. However, one area of Carlsbad is different as it was laid out and built under a different land planning program now referred to as “***Traditional Town Planning***”. That area was the city's starting point, a start that took place much earlier. Its planning program built a relatively small multi-use core area on a tight grid of Main Street type thoroughfares. This gives that area, the Village-Barrio, ***a different and unique character in all of Carlsbad.***

***Now the question of where to put our City Hall.*** An opportunity to create a new Flagship facility with civic amenities that will be embraced as a proud symbol representing our community. It should be a model of City government ***efficiency and professionalism. A symbolic element that reinforces its general location as a “point of focus” for the community, a Town Center.***



**MID CITY** - Two sites that are geo-centric to be more equal distant from both south and north areas of town.

**NORTH WEST CORNER** - The two sites that will support of the City's Historic Heart Neighborhood (the Village / South Village - our Historic Barrio).

### **OUR CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING THESE POTENTIAL SITES**

- ★ City Hall as a highly productive and stimulating work place environment
- ★ Accessibility for Employees, Business Guest & the Community
- ★ Presences/Imagery - A Flagship facility with high visibility that represents our community Pride
- ★ Civic Amenities for the community
- ★ ***Its relationships with its surrounding area Synergy & Symbiotic (2+2=5)***

Back to Carlsbad being a great place to live. Taking this as a given can we now pause and reflect on all that we have, all that we done but also do some ***objective evaluation of what we may have missed, what we may be lacking?*** This review should influence the evaluation of where our ultimate City Hall should be placed. What ingredient might be needed to strengthen our community, to its sense of place, its sense of identity and pride. The element that should have come out of that objective evaluation as missing is a Town Center. As far as we know a ***Town Center*** has never been put on any map, never been part of any plan in all of our town planning. ***We submit that a recognizable Town Center is very important to a city the size of Carlsbad adding to our community's sense of place, identity and pride.***

***All along our town planning journey we have had the "Historic Heart", the starting point of town but we really never saw the need to fully wrap our arms around it.*** To elevate it as our point of focus for the full community as a recognized Town Center. "It is up there in the far corner", "shouldn't a town center be in the center of town?" It's our starting point and hence it was logically located on the coast line, on the regional highway, on the rail line. Yes today it is the NW corner of our town just one of the city's four corners. The flip side of this can be expressed in one word, "***Car-nitas***". This term, we have heard, is used by some who live in south Carlsbad but have a Encinitas state of mind. Why do these people relate more to Encinitas, certainly it has nothing to do with their City Hall.



***However, this should be seen as a tear in our community's fabric of cohesiveness and belonging.*** Some believe the fix is to place our "seat of power" the City Hall in the center of town so it is seen as equal in its reach and representation. "That makes sense on paper", as they say, if centered it is equal right?. However the next question is, does that get us where we should want to be, is it really just that simple, we think not. ***Rarely is a City Hall on its own a Town Center***, an important part yes but as a stand alone facility it is hard pressed to pull that kind of weight. Make it a Civic Center by adding civic amenities, like a learning center/Library with auditorium or exhibit hall, already done ***at "the Dove" along with another civic staple a Federal Post Office***, or may be give it a larger performing arts venue. An objective evaluation will show that it will be very difficult if not impossible to create a true Town Center at the mid City sites. As we know, we already own land in the Center of town. Rather than place ***a stand alone City Hall at Farmers***, as an island in the employment center sea. May be we make that site a different feature for the community, a larger performing arts venue, say an amphitheater. May be not, as we did have one of these proposed in our town some time back. But due to the cold shoulder reaction it received here that proposal moved on to Poway. It then lost out in a head to head competition with a proposal for a theater in Chula Vista. How many of us in Carlsbad want to travel to Chula Vista or even S.D. State to go to a performance in an amphitheater? But nice if we had that venue close in.

***If we can agree that our community will benefit significantly by having a strong Town Center, a point of focus for all of us.*** If we can agree to have a Town Center as a new and major goal (a Council Goal) and also agree that the City Hall should be placed at our Town Center. We should take into consideration how the four candidate sites for City Hall measure up to a set of criteria for this role as a flagship facility, as an important part of the community's Town Center. As has been expressed, if a mid city locations have little chance to become a strong and meaningful Town Center then where? The Village also does not currently carry that weight. However, unlike mid town it does have that potential, it's just not there yet. So the real question here is what must we do to make it so. ***To make the Village a true Town Center that has that weight, that gravity to draw all of us to it, even those "Car-nitas". But that is a topic for another session, another paper. A session to tackle that question, and to ask if we have that kind of vision, that kind of resolve to strengthen Carlsbad as a community made whole with a compelling Town Center ?***



*Imagine  
Carlsbad*

**WHAT MAKES FOR A SUCCESSFUL TOWN CENTER** Jan1 2021

A Center with many activities and services creating a significant draw that becomes a local attraction, a destination for the entire community.

A Center that provides a special setting assisted by its character and ambiance enhancing the community's sense of place, identity and pride.

A Center that is easy to locate, offers easy access and has adequate fundamentals for all its uses and planned events.

A Center that can host a full range of special events throughout the year.

A Center where there are strong public/private partnerships and many active community groups.

A Center strengthened by the inclusion of the town's Seat of Power (City Hall) placed at a location of prominence and status. A flagship facility that also offers as many features for community use as its layout can accommodate.

A Center with a high level of authenticity and/or heritage, it is optimal if the location has an innate quality to it. Something special took place there, something special was built there, something was started at this location that has meaning to the community. This should enhance its prominence and status adding depth in the community's sense of time, sense of longevity.

A Center with ample public land, although the center can include a mix of both public and private properties, it must be rich in our public domain. Allowing easy public movement unencumbered by private rights. A location where there are also ample areas for the public to gather. Where one gathering location is widely held to be the venue for public expression. Where the community comes together to hold a hand over heart, where they push both hands high into the air with movement and rhythm, where, after sunset, they hold lights tight in hand as an expression of a collective spirit.