Memorandum

Date: April 17, 2020
To: Comprehensive Plan Review Committee Members
From: Christina Day, AICP, Director of Planning
Subject: Follow Up to CPRC Questions Memo #3 (Transportation)

A number of questions have been brought up by CPRC members through the kickoff survey and subsequent meetings. Staff has prepared supporting information and answers to committee questions below. Additional questions will be answered in future memorandums as staff is able to provide the answers.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

1. Transportation Glossary

The following terms may be helpful as the Committee begins discussion the Transportation topic:
(Sources: Federal Highway Administration [FHWA], Institute of Transportation Engineers [ITE], Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Center, National Association of City Transportation Officials [NACTO], North Central Texas Council of Governments [NCTCOG], City of Plano)

**Thoroughfare Plan and Roadway System**
- Thoroughfares – Major streets (and their rights-of-way, including improvements between pavement edge and right-of-way line) in urban areas that fall under the conventional functional classifications of arterials and collector streets, excluding limited-access facilities.
- Expressway – A controlled access, divided arterial highway for through traffic, the intersections of which are usually separated from other roadways by differing grades.
- Regional Arterial/Major Thoroughfare/Secondary Thoroughfare (Arterials) – A class of streets serving major traffic movements (higher-speed, higher volume) for longer distance travel between major points.
- Collector – A class of street that typically balances traffic mobility and property access. Collector streets provide land access and traffic circulation within residential neighborhoods, commercial and industrial areas. Collector streets distribute trips from the arterials through the area to the ultimate destination.
- Local Street – Streets with a low level of traffic mobility, intended solely for access to adjacent properties. The location and alignment of local streets are not regulated by the Thoroughfare Plan but rather though the subdivision development process.
- Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) – The application of advanced technologies to improve the efficiency and safety of transportation systems.
- Multimodal – The availability of transportation options using different modes within a system or corridor, whether it be walking, bicycling, driving, or transit.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation**
- Trail/Shared-Use Path – Physically separated from roads, trails or shared-use paths are accessible two-way paths designated for use by both bicyclists and pedestrians.
- Bike Lane – A Bike Lane is defined as a portion of the roadway that has been designated by striping, signage, and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists. Bike lanes may be designed as buffered or separated facilities with marked or physical separation elements.
- Bike Route/Shared Lanes – On bike routes with shared lanes, bicyclists ride in mixed traffic. These routes should typically be reserved for routes with low traffic volumes and roadways with operating speeds of 35 miles per hour or less.
- Safe Routes to School – Safe Routes to School is a nationwide initiative established in 2005, focused on encouraging and enabling more children to safely walk and bicycle to school, thereby improving student health and traffic congestion around schools.
- Americans with Disability Act (ADA) – The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became effective in 1991. It is a civil rights law that provides for, and protects, equal opportunity for individuals with disabilities. The City of Plano, by this federal civil rights law, is required to conduct an ADA Self-Evaluation and Transition Plan. The Plan, in simple terms, is an assessment of the level of ADA compliance and an action plan for improving accessibility.

Transit
- Bus Transit – Bus is a mode of transit service characterized by roadway vehicles powered by diesel, gasoline, battery, or alternative fuel engines contained within the vehicle. Vehicles operate on streets and roadways in fixed-route or other regular service. Types of bus service include local service, express service, limited-stop service, and bus rapid transit (BRT).
- Light Rail Transit – Light Rail is a mode of transit service operating passenger rail cars on fixed rails in right-of-way that is often separated from other traffic for part or much of the way. Light rail vehicles are typically driven electrically with power being drawn from an overhead electric line.
- Streetcar – Streetcar transit operates with vehicles similar to light rail transit and often operate within the same street right-of-way as automobiles. Streetcar service also tends to include more closely spaced stops, similar to local bus service.
- Commuter/Regional Rail – Commuter Rail is a mode of transit service characterized by an electric or diesel propelled railway typically serving longer lines with fewer stations and lower frequency of service.

Other Transportation Terms and Concepts
- Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) – A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) develops public/private partnerships to coordinate land use and transportation facility development. Both the City of Plano and the land developer share in the responsibility to consider all reasonable solutions to identified transportation problems. The TIA study looks at development size and use and determines the effect of that use on the existing roadway system.
- Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) - Vehicle miles traveled (VMT) measures the amount of travel for all vehicles in a geographic region over a given period of time, typically a one-year period.
- Mode Share – Mode share is the share of people using a particular mode of transport.
- Transportation Demand Management (TDM) – Transportation demand management (TDM) is defined a set of strategies aimed at maximizing traveler choices. This typically includes providing travelers with travel choices, such as work location, route, time of travel and mode.

2. Transportation Data and Presentations

Transportation Town Hall; May 9, 2019:
- Video: http://planotx.swagit.com/play/05092019-1649
- Presentations from:
  o NTTA, Elizabeth Mow, Assistant Executive Director of Infrastructure, starts at 3:38
DART Quarterly Update, December 17, 2019:
- Video: http://planotx.swagit.com/play/12172019-2977/#4
- Presentation from Gary Thomas, Executive Director of DART, starts at 30:25

Pavement Management Plan Presentation, May 28, 2020:
- Video: http://planotx.swagit.com/play/05282019-2589/#7
- Presentation from Public Works Assistant Director Dan Prendergast, starts at 32:15

Public Works Presentation, March 17, 2020:
- Video: http://planotx.swagit.com/play/03172020-1726/#13
- Presentation from Public Works Director Gerald Cosgrove, starts at 46:26
  - Agenda Item and Attachments: https://plano.novusagenda.com/agendapublic/CoverSheet.aspx?ItemID=2045&MeetingID=1003

Engineering Departmental Presentations, July 23, 2018:
- Video: http://planotx.swagit.com/play/07232018-1340/#7
- Community Investment Program (CIP) Presentation from Engineering Director Caleb Thornhill, starts at 5:51
  - Agenda Item and Attachments: https://plano.novusagenda.com/agendapublic/CoverSheet.aspx?ItemID=2045&MeetingID=1003
- Traffic and Transportation Engineering Division Presentation from Transportation Engineering Manager Brian Shewski, starts at 19:12
  - Agenda Item and Attachments: https://plano.novusagenda.com/agendapublic/CoverSheet.aspx?ItemID=1894&MeetingID=1003

3. DART

Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) is a regional transit agency authorized under Chapter 452 of the Texas Transportation Code and was created by voters and funded with a one-cent local sales tax on August 13, 1983. The service area consists of 13 cities: Addison, Carrollton, Cockrell Hill, Dallas, Farmers Branch, Garland, Glenn Heights, Highland Park, Irving, Plano, Richardson, Rowlett, and University Park. As of March 2020, DART serves its 13 Service Area cities with 148 bus or shuttle routes, 13 On-Demand GoLink zones, 93 miles of light rail transit (DART Rail), and paratransit service for persons who are mobility impaired.

Current major DART initiatives include:
- System Wide
  - DART is updating the Transit System Plan, which will outline agency capital and operating priorities through year 2045, with a focus on Mobility as a Service (MaaS), new services and programs, and optimization of the current system.
- Bus Service
  - Following the October 2018 Service Standards update, including addition of a new Core Frequent Route category, the DART Board authorized a new Bus Service Plan
effort. Called the DARTZoom Bus Network Redesign, this effort includes extensive public and stakeholder input and will be complete in Spring 2021 to guide bus network changes in 2022 and beyond.

- **Light Rail Transit Service**
  - Red/Blue Line Platform Extensions are under construction in 2019 and will be completed in 2022 to allow for 3-car operations to address crowding during peak times.
  - DART continues to advance transit-oriented development (TOD) initiatives through an update of its TOD Policy and new TOD Guidelines.

- **Streetcar**
  - DART is preparing a Streetcar Master Plan as an element of the Transit System Plan which will identify potential expansion opportunities.

- **Commuter/Regional Rail**
  - The Silver Line Regional Rail project (in the Cotton Belt corridor) is in the design-build phase and is expected to open by December 2022. The Silver Line will provide east-west service through seven cities along a 26-mile corridor from Plano to DFW International Airport.

The [March 2020 DART Reference Book](https://www.plano.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5468) compiles the latest information on the DART system, including information on ridership, operations, facilities, and budget.

4. **Studies for Reference**

The following reports and studies are included in your packet for your reference:

- Legacy Business Area Mobility Study Report [https://www.plano.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5468](https://www.plano.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5468)
- Parks Master Plan [https://www.plano.gov/943/Park-Master-Plan](https://www.plano.gov/943/Park-Master-Plan)
- DART studies [https://dart.org/about/publications.asp](https://dart.org/about/publications.asp)
- DART Current and Future Services Map [https://dart.org/maps/currentandfutureservicesmap.asp](https://dart.org/maps/currentandfutureservicesmap.asp)
- NCTCOG Mobility 2045 [https://www.nctcog.org/trans/plan/mtp/2045](https://www.nctcog.org/trans/plan/mtp/2045)
- DART Transit System Plan [https://dart.org/about/expansion/transitsystemplan.asp](https://dart.org/about/expansion/transitsystemplan.asp)
- Envision Oak Point [https://www.plano.gov/3353/Envision-Oak-Point-Plan](https://www.plano.gov/3353/Envision-Oak-Point-Plan)

See pages 49-60 of [Chapter 4: Recommendations](https://www.plano.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/5468) for goals, policies, and actions related to mobility in Oak Point.

ANSWERS TO CPRC QUESTIONS

1. **What does “all modes of transportation” mean?**
The **Roadway System Policy** states that “Plano will develop an integrated, multimodal transportation system, through the utilization of technology and innovative concepts that improves the safety and efficiency of the roadway system for all users.” The RS4 action states that Plano will “Review and update roadway standards to accommodate all modes of transportation.”

“Modes of transportation” includes the variety of possible users of the city’s roadways. These can include people driving cars, motorcycles, commercial freight trucking, walking, bicycling, and utilizing transit or rideshare services. Traditional roadway design and construction has prioritized accommodation of vehicles, with little to no consistent accommodation of alternate modes or safety of vulnerable roadway users, such as pedestrians, people with disabilities, and cyclists. Updated roadway standards would provide new options for designing streets to better accommodate multiple modes of transportation and provide transportation solutions appropriate for surrounding development. For example, in areas where destinations are located within a walking or transit-oriented scale, roadway standard options can include design elements that better balance safety and convenience for pedestrians, transit riders, and drivers.

2. **How would you measure “good transportation”**?

Various performance measures can be used to quantify the quality of a city or region’s transportation system. These often include goals related to mobility, safety, the environment, the economy, and social equity. For example the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has developed a guide of transportation performance measures that may be useful in evaluating transportation decisions against desired goals. These performance measures include:

- Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per Capita – the amount of vehicle activity per person; reducing per capita VMT can help a region achieve air quality, climate change, and congestion reduction goals
- Average Vehicle Occupancy (AVO) – the average number of people in each vehicle; higher AVO impacts congestion levels, overall emissions, and transportation system affordability
- Mixed Land Uses – Locating activities closer together can reduce trip lengths, increase opportunities to combine trips, and allow trips to be made by walking and bicycling rather than by driving.
- Transit Accessibility – the relative convenience of transit as a mode choice
- Transit Productivity – how much travelers use the transit service (return on investment)
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Mode Share – opportunities for travelers to choose walking or biking for work, non-work, or recreational trips
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Activity and Safety – bicycle/pedestrian counts and number of crashes over time
- Bicycle and Pedestrian Level of Service – the quality of service from the perspective of a bicyclist or pedestrian, which includes comfort and perceived safety
- Transportation Affordability – measures the cost of transportation relative to income

3. **Define parking maximums and explain the necessity**

The **Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Policy** states that “Plano will proactively encourage and incentivize development within walking distance of existing and future rail stations or bus transit centers to create an integrated mix of uses including residential, employment, retail, and civic spaces.” The TOD4 action states that Plano will “Establish parking maximums in transit-served areas and identified Compact Complete Centers.”

Conventional zoning practices typically include minimum parking requirements to ensure enough room for cars that may need to park at each development type. This can result in large parking lots or garages required for each development. In transit-oriented areas, parking demand is typically lower and large parking areas could be utilized for more productive land use activity.
Parking ratios and standards can take into account walkability and the convenience and availability of transit options. In a transit-oriented environment, it is important to use land efficiently to support pedestrian trips. Reduced off-street parking requirements or parking maximums frees up space for additional development or other uses accessible within a walking distance from a transit station. Structured parking is expensive to build and parking requirements that are too high can impact the feasibility and affordability of transit-oriented development.

Cities across the country utilize this approach, and strategies to limit the construction of parking lots that are larger than necessary can vary. Examples include:
- Charlotte, NC – sets minimum and maximum parking standards within transit-oriented development districts. Exceptions are permitted to reduce the minimum or exceed the maximum under certain conditions.
- Denver, CO – requires developers to ask special permission to include parking above the parking minimum within special districts.
- Hartford, CT – removed parking minimum requirements downtown to make it easier for developers to rehab downtown buildings by not having to add parking as part of redevelopment.

4. What is a journey to work trip?

The Transportation Demand Management Policy states that “Plano will utilize Transportation Demand Management to improve air quality, reduce journey to work trips, and mitigate traffic congestion.”

The U.S. Census Bureau defines a “journey to work” trip as a worker’s travel from home to work. These trips can include many methods of travel:
- Driving a personal vehicle
- Riding transit
- Riding a bicycle
- Walking
- Working from home (telecommuting)

Transportation demand management (TDM) seeks to reduce the reliance on personal vehicles for journey to work trips and create competitive options for travel. Some TDM programs can target a particular area, such as the work being done by the Legacy Area Transportation Management Association, an organization engaging locally in TDM to stagger trips and promote telecommuting to reduce demand.

Land use decisions also go hand-in-hand with successful transportation demand management. For example, minimizing distances between jobs, housing, and services can shorten driving trips or reduce the need for driving trips. Additionally, small street block sizes, activated ground floors, and improved multimodal access can support travel choices by foot, bike, or transit.

5. How many Plano residents use DART?

Unfortunately, the information on the residency of DART ridership is collected primarily through random sampling. City staff does not have this information available at this time, but does have information regarding ridership in Plano.

Average weekday ridership for Plano’s light rail transit stations in FY2019 are as follows:
- Parker Road – 3,325
- Downtown Plano – 660
Parker Road Station currently has the 5th highest ridership within the light rail system, and the highest ridership outside of the Dallas Central Business District. Total average weekday light rail transit ridership across the DART network is 92,700. Total average weekday bus ridership across the DART network is 138,300.

6. What would second-tier membership of DART entail?

Regarding service agreements with cities outside of the DART service area, DART’s Policy III.07 enables DART to develop service agreements with cities outside of the DART service area for rail, bus or paratransit services. A key element of the policy is that within the first 36 months of service, DART and the City shall jointly fund and prepare a transit system plan and a supporting financial plan for the municipality or county that includes projected costs and revenues and includes a plan for becoming a DART member. Currently DART does not have a policy to provide “second tier membership”, however DART is continuing to discuss additional opportunities for service outside the DART service area boundary.

7. Is there a demand for bicycling in Plano? Is there a demand for more pedestrian and bicycle oriented development?

Through the Plano Tomorrow Public Outreach Process, which included a public online survey with 1,375 participants, positive feedback was received regarding existing bicycle infrastructure and the demand for additional facilities. Plano residents ranked bicycle facilities similarly with automobile and walking as desired transportation choices for increased access today and in the future.
When asked about “Favorite Places in Plano”, “bike trails and greenbelts” were popular responses in the survey. The desire for bicycle facilities (dedicated lanes, trails, routes) was a common comment on the final open response question in the survey.

Additionally, in the Parks and Recreation Plan online and telephone surveys, 86%, or 2,970 respondents, said it was very important or important for the city to construct more trails in the next 5-10 years. The city’s trail counter program has indicated a steady increase in trail use between 2015 and 2017. Counters are located on seven city trails to measure how and when trails are used:

- 2015 total: 507,574 (261,463 pedestrians and 246,111 bicyclists)
- 2016 total: 541,055 (288,946 pedestrians and 252,109 bicyclists)
- 2017 total: 549,851 (303,121 pedestrians and 246,730 bicyclists)

In 2017, the North Central Council of Governments (NCTCOG) commissioned a Bicycle Opinion telephone survey of residents to capture the views of the public-at-large about bicycle use across the region to help guide future bicycle plans and projects that affect bicyclists. An additional 200 interviews were conducted with Plano residents to measure local opinions compared to the region. Key findings from the Plano surveys include:

- Nearly half, 48%, of respondents had bicycled at least once in the past 12 months. This was a greater proportion than had been observed in the NCTCOG region as a whole, 36%.
- Spring and fall were the most popular time of year for bicycling, while winter was the least likely time for bicyclists to go for a ride.
- A majority of respondents (66%) indicated that there are “too few” on-street dedicated bike lanes in their communities.
- More than 60% of respondents considered improvements to increase bicycle access to be “essential” or “very important” for their community.

The current Comprehensive Plan Roadway System Action Statements include a recommendation to develop a transportation plan that addresses bicycles and pedestrians as a mode of transportation. A multimodal transportation planning process can assess current bicycling and walking interest levels, levels of comfort, and barriers to potential multimodal trips in the city. Bicycle and pedestrian needs, comfort levels and preferences can vary greatly throughout a community, and a robust public engagement process can identify and prioritize an appropriate set of improvements to meet the needs of interested multimodal trip users.

8. **How can you retrofit streets never designed for bikes?**

Accommodating people riding bikes on suburban arterial roadways and creating facilities that are comfortable for a wide range of riders can be a challenge, but there are emerging best practices and examples from cities with similar roadways. Latest national best practices include the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) [*Bikeway Selection Guide*](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/roadside/bike/guide/) and the National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO) [*Urban Bikeway Design Guide*](https://www.nacto.org/Urban-Bikeway-Design-Guide). Latest guidance includes that cyclists should not be expected to share lanes with vehicles traveling over 35 MPH. Depending on surrounding land uses, expected demand, and available right of way, separated bike lanes or shared-use paths adjacent to the roadway may be appropriate solutions. Intersection design should also be evaluated to make crossings of both bicyclists and pedestrian safe and intuitive. As certain areas redevelop over time, it may be possible to add new minor street connections to provide additional bicycle and pedestrian routes separate from major thoroughfares.

9. **What bike usage is expected for main transportation especially in summer heat?**

In the 2017 NCTCOG Bicycle Opinion Survey, hot weather was the reason most frequently cited by City of Plano residents as an impediment to biking, mentioned by about two-thirds of respondents (62%). While hot weather conditions may be a deterring factor for some riders, overall demand can
increase during cooler seasons, and bike facilities should be planned and prioritized for all types of riders and trip purposes. Ongoing public engagement about bicycle interests and needs can help the city prioritize the best locations and types of bike facilities for all riders. For example, bicycling for transportation (i.e. commuting to work or other utilitarian trips) is often most efficient for trips of shorter distance (a few miles or less), so facilities for this trip type may be most beneficial in areas where people can travel between destinations that are relatively close together. Alternatively, recreational cyclists may be more interested in cycling longer distances using trails, sidepaths, or separated bike lanes and in a wider range of weather conditions.

10. Do other communities have extensive trails to connect?

Regarding regional trail connectivity, essentially every neighboring community has planned or existing trails that the City of Plano can connect to, with some cities being further along than others with trail system implementation. The North Central Council of Governments (NCTCOG) maintains a Regional Veloweb plan to promote these intercity trail connections. Some of the existing neighboring trails that Plano does not currently have a connection to include the Preston Ridge Trail in Dallas, the Renner and Spring Creek trails in Richardson, and the Cottonwood Creek/Mustang Creek trails in Allen. The NCTCOG 2020 Highlighted Regional Trails of North Texas identifies over 300 miles of regional trails including new connections in progress over the next few years.
Memorandum

Date: April 17, 2020

To: Ed Drain, Chief of Police

From: Danny Alexander, Planning and Research Division Manager

Subject: Plano Crime Rates vs. United States Crime Rates

On February 20, 2020, at the requests of City Planning Director, Christina Day, DCM Greg Rushin did a short presentation to the Comprehensive Plan Review Committee about crime and Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). During the presentation, two concerns arose that required additional information for the Committee.

First, a committee member questioned whether Plano is truly a safer city as is purported or has crime in Plano simply paralleled the national major crime trend for the past 20 years. The reduction of crime in Plano over the past 20 years has not just merely followed a national trend. The analysis of crime trends in the United States and Plano is discussed below.

Second, Committee Member Mike Bronsky asked for a longitudinal statistical comparison of safety in multi-family v. single family housing. The Plano Police Department is unable to accurately provide comparative crime data for multi-family v. single family housing. We are unable to separate out crimes that occurred at public and common areas in and around an apartment complex, which makes it incomparable to single family residences by themselves. Below is information and analysis on the two issues.

Major crime rates in the United States peaked in approximately 1991 for violent crimes and 1990 for property crimes. Since then, violent and property crime rates in the United States have fallen by 51.3 percent and 57.2 percent, respectively. In contrast, Plano’s violent crime rate peaked in 1995 and its property crime rate peaked in 1991. Since these peaks, violent and property crime rates in Plano have decreased by 65.6 percent and 68.6 percent, respectively.
If just the decline of major crime rates over the past 20 years are examined Plano continued to outperform the national average. During this period, the United States experienced a 29.5 percent and 41.2 percent decrease in violent and property crime rates, respectively. For the same period, Plano’s violent and property crime rates decreased by 61.1 percent and 46.4 percent, respectively. A simple way to illustrate this is visible in the Figures 1 and 2 below. The Figure 1 normalizes 1999 violent crime rates in both Plano and the United States to 100, while the Figure 2 uses the same methodology for property crime rates. The Figures below show the 1999 crime rates normalize to 100, with the crime rates in every year after represented as a percentage of the 1999 number. This allows for an easy visualization of change in crime rates over time. As shown in the Figures 1, 2, and 3 major crime rates in Plano declined more precipitously than the national major crime rates.

Figure 1, Changes in Violent Crime Rates Since 1999, Plano and United States (1999 set to 100)
Examining the major crime rates for 2001 through 2018, Plano again outperformed the national crime reduction. Nationally, the violent crime rate declined 26.9 percent while Plano’s violent crime rate fell by 46.5 percent. Similarly, national property crimes declined by 39.9 percent and Plano’s decline by 53.8 percent. See Figure 3.
Plano has posted the lowest major crime rates for at least the past 13 years for Texas cities with populations 200,000 and over. Figure 4 shows the 2018 major crime rates for Texas cities with populations 200,000 and over.
In conclusion, both property and violent crime rates in Plano have fallen more than the national average, both over the last twenty years and since the early 90’s when crime rates peaked. Thus, even as the United States has experienced an unprecedented crime decline over roughly the last two decades, Plano has generally outperformed the national crime trend.

**Longitudinal Study and Comparative Crime Data for Multi-Family Housing vs. Single Family Housing.**

The Plano Police Department is unable to accurately provide comparative crime data for multi-family apartment complexes and single-family residences. We are unable to separate out crimes that occurred at public and common areas in and around an apartment complex, which makes it incomparable to single-family residences by themselves. However, the Department’s Planning and Research Division reviewed academic and independent research articles on the effects of land use on crime. The findings were mixed on whether multi-family housing has an impact on crime rate. Brief summations of the reviewed research findings are below:
The University of California Irvine and Florida State University findings showed that “older aged housing tended to have higher levels of crime when controlling for the sociodemographic characteristics of the area. [Also] crime is far less likely to occur [in areas] with detached single-family units compared with other types of housing.”

The Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University prepared a report that addressed the following claims:

- “Apartments overburden schools, produce less revenue for local governments, and require more infrastructure support
- Higher-density housing creates traffic congestion and parking problems
- Multifamily apartments lower the value of single-family homes in the neighborhood
- People who live in apartments are less desirable neighbors and more likely to engage in crime or other anti-social behavior.”

However, this report found no evidence to support those claims, in fact their research seemed to contradict the above claims. Specifically, based on available research, they found that multifamily rental housing is not more likely to attract individuals who engage in criminal activity, does not increase traffic, does not harm property values, and impose no greater costs to local governments than single family residences. “This evidence may be sufficient for planners and many public officials – particularly those who have already come to understand the benefits of greater housing choice, mixed-use and mixed-income residences, transit-oriented development, and pedestrian-friendly communities. Two obstacles remain: codified restrictions on multifamily developments and individual opposition to specific multifamily projects. Experience suggests that opponents who live near apartment developments are often hard to convince. For some, opposition to apartments may be more emotional than analytical.” (Obrinksy and Stein 2006)

School of Urban and Public Affairs at The University of Texas at Arlington and the Department of Community Development at the City of Irving Texas research found that “high density and multifamily development are not necessarily associated with high crime rate, but socioeconomic status is. In
addition, crimes could happen in any geographic locations, and different types of crime are apt to occur in different types of neighborhoods... The results of this study also imply that housing and land-use policies stressing low density should be reconsidered, and crime prevention should not neglect the importance of social policies aimed at improving education attainment and social and economic equity.” (Li and Rainwater 2000)

The School of Public and Environmental Affairs Indiana University Public Policy Institute Indiana University–Purdue University Indianapolis found “that the effects of busy roads, high density residential units, commerce and industrial land uses on violent crime counts all depended on the disadvantage index... Thus, both residential and nonresidential land uses can increase or decrease crime but their effects depend on the socioeconomic context surrounding them.” (Stucky and Ottensmann 2009)

University of Maryland found that “the available evidence increasingly tends to suggest that most types of crime tend to increase in levels of occurrence with increasing population density. This relationship, however, is moderated by SES [socioeconomic status]. A cluster of affluent high-rise apartments in Mumbai or New York may have high density, but will also have a high level of guardianship, thus inhibiting crime. On the other hand, a high density poverty area will incorporate in its lifestyle incentives for predatory behaviors and disincentives for guardianship, given the hazards associated with confronting criminals (on their turf) or witnessing criminal acts.” (Harries 2006)

Elliott D. Pollack and Company conducted a study the Arizona Multi-housing Association which concluded that “the perception of higher crime associated with multifamily housing results from counting police calls by address. Hence an apartment property with 100 or more units at the same address may be wrongly compared to one single-family residence. In actuality, when police data is analyzed on a per unit basis, the rate of police activity in apartment communities is no worse than in single family subdivisions, and in many cases, is lower than in single family areas.” (Pollack 1996)
The Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University stated that “apartments, when well designed and monitored, can also provide important security benefits and protection from crime.” (Colton and Collignon 2001)

The University of Texas at San Antonio and the University of Washington research findings suggest that “assisted housing programs should invest in security and design features, encourage management practices that reduce opportunities for criminal behavior, and locate developments in economically diverse communities.” (Tillyer and Walter 2019)

The University of Washington Bothell found that “dense, mixed-use areas actually exhibit lower crime rates than typical residential areas. Furthermore, crime rates are broadly declining with [increased] residential density.” (Twinam 2017)
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Meeting Via Videoconference

DATE: April 21, 2020

TIME: 6:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

OUR VISION: PLANO IS A GLOBAL ECONOMIC LEADER BONDED BY A SHARED SENSE OF COMMUNITY WHERE RESIDENTS EXPERIENCE UNPARALLELED QUALITY OF LIFE.

The Comprehensive Plan Review Committee may convene into Executive Session to discuss posted items in the regular meeting as allowed by law.

The Comprehensive Plan Review Committee meeting will be held via videoconference. The Committee members, consultants, and staff will participate remotely via videoconference. The facility will not be open to the public. For those wanting to watch the meeting, the meeting will be live streamed at: https://plano.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_a8TswJspT8OC0shOeNU-g.

As an ad hoc Committee of the City of Plano, the Open Meetings Act does not apply. This meeting will not include public comments. An audio recording of the meeting will be made available on www.PlanoCompPlanReview.org.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

1. Approval of Minutes: April 14, 2020  Zarate
2. Presentation: Transportation Overview  Haas
3. Presentation: Transportation and Comprehensive Plans  Sefko
4. Discussion and Direction: Transportation Actions in Plano Tomorrow  Harrison
5. Work Plan Updates  Sefko

ITEMS FOR FUTURE DISCUSSION

This portion of the meeting is to allow the Comprehensive Plan Review Committee to identify issues or topics that they wish to discuss at a future meeting.

ADJOURN

COUNCIL LIAISONS: Council Member Kayci Prince and Council Member Lily Bao
Chair Shockey convened the Committee into the regular meeting on Tuesday, April 14, 2020, at 6:01 p.m. via videoconference. Fifteen Committee members were present. Member Solomon was absent. Chair Shockey led the Committee in the Pledge of Allegiance.
ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION

1) **Approval of Minutes: March 3, 2020**

   MOTION: Upon a motion made by Member Crawford and seconded by Vice Chair Bronsky, the Committee voted 14-0 to approve the March 3, 2020, Regular Meeting minutes with no modifications. Chair Shockey abstained.

2) **Presentation: Changes to Committee Work Plan in Response to COVID-19** – Mr. Sefko gave a presentation on proposed changes Committee’s Work Plan in response to COVID-19. Prior to the City’s disaster declaration, the Committee was scheduled to continue discussion on the Density (Housing) topic and receive a presentation from Sara Bonser, Superintendent of the Plano Independent School District, on at the March 18 meeting. Due to COVID-19, Ms. Bonser does not have a timetable for when she will be available to speak to the Committee. As a result, Mr. Sefko requested the Committee consider moving to the transportation topic in future meetings after finishing discussions planned from the March 18 meeting. No votes will be taken or official direction be provided on housing density until the Superintendent is able to meet with the Committee at a later date. Mr. Sefko informed the Committee that official direction on change to the Work Plan would be considered in Agenda Item No. 6.

3) **Discussion: Freese and Nichols, Inc. Summary of Issues** – Mr. Sefko presented a summary of his two page summary of possible solutions to housing issues in the Comprehensive Plan Review. Some questions were asked and discussion was held.

4) **Discussion: Committee Homework Results** – Daniel Harrison gave a presentation and led the Committee in a discussion regarding the results of the Housing Homework Assignment. Some questions were asked and discussion was held. Member Liu requested that future homework assignments be web-based if possible. Chair Shockey suggested any future homework assignments be tailored to specific topics.

5) **Presentation: Committee Perspectives on the Plano Tomorrow Plan** – Chair Shockey gave Committee members an opportunity to share their issues and concerns regarding the Plano Tomorrow Plan. Member Beckley shared concerns about moving quickly on the review process in light of unknown impacts of COVID-19. In response, Chair Shockey noted that the Committee could return to previously discussed topics as new information is provided. Chair Shockey noted his biggest concern regarding the Plan is redevelopment of neighborhood centers.

6) **Discussion and Direction: CPRC Work Plan Updates** – Mr. Sefko informed the Committee that the Work Plan was updated to reflect discussion from Agenda Item No. 1, including moving to Transportation at the April 21 meeting.

   MOTION: Upon a motion made by Member Howe and seconded by Member Crawford, the Committee voted 15-0 to approve approved proposed changes to the Work Plan.
Mr. Sefko informed the Committee that the next meeting will start a discussion regarding transportation. With no further discussion, Chair Shockey adjourned the meeting at 7:39 p.m.

Doug Shockey, Chair
Agenda Item 2

Presentation: Transportation Overview

DESCRIPTION:

Receive a broad overview of transportation and related issues pertinent to comprehensive planning.

REMARKS:

To kickoff the CPRC discussion on the topic of transportation, Eddie Haas, AICP, with Freese and Nichols, Inc. will provide an overview of transportation issues in Plano and the surrounding region. Items to be presented include:

1. Key Transportation Entities in the Region
2. Plano’s Roadway System
3. Transportation and Land Use Connection
4. Regional Growth and Traffic Congestion
5. Employment Impacts
6. Future Transportation Projects
7. Plano Transportation Strengths and Weakness
8. Best Practices
9. Transit-Oriented Development
10. Current Issues in Transportation

RECOMMENDATION:

No action is required.

ATTACHMENTS:

None.
Agenda Item 3

Presentation: Transportation and Comprehensive Plans

DESCRIPTION:

Receive a presentation on how comprehensive plans typically discuss transportation-related issues.

REMARKS:

Dan Sefko, FAICP, of Freese and Nichols, Inc. will give a presentation on the general topics, terminology, and tools used in comprehensive plans related to transportation. These include thoroughfare plans, bike and pedestrian plans, planning for capital improvements, promoting multimodal transportation, pedestrian safety improvements, community design principles, traffic management, regional transportation issues, and the connection to land use.

RECOMMENDATION:

No action is required.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – Thoroughfare Plan Map and Sections
Attachment B – Bicycle Transportation Map
Thoroughfare Plan Map and Cross-Sections adopted by Council on October 12, 2015 as part of the Plano Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan.

LEGEND
Thoroughfare Plan Types

- **Type A:** Expressway (variable lanes)
- **Type B and B+:** Regional Arterial (6 lanes divided)
- **Type C:** Major Thoroughfare (6 lanes divided)
- **Type C1:** Major Thoroughfare (6 lanes divided with on street parking)
- **Type D:** Secondary Thoroughfare (4 lanes divided)
- **Type E:** Secondary Thoroughfare (4 lanes undivided)
- **Type F:** Collector Street (2 lanes undivided)
- **D (Future):**
- **F (Future):**
- **Interchange Grade Separation**
- **City Limit**
Thoroughfare Plan Map and Cross-Sections adopted by Council on October 12, 2015 as part of the Plano Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan.

For applicable cross-section dimensions, please refer to Thoroughfare Standards Ordinance.

Type A
(E8DA)
Freeway - Regional - No Frontage Roads

Type B
(M6DA)
Arterial - Regional

Type B+
(M6DA)
Arterial - Regional With 12’ Access Lanes

Type C
(M6D)
Major Thoroughfare

Type D
(S4D)
Secondary Thoroughfare

Type E
(S4U)
Secondary Thoroughfare

Type F
(S2U)
Collector

Type G
(R2U)
Residential / Local
Bicycle Transportation Plan adopted by City Council on October 22, 2018 as a part of the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan and the Plano Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan.

The locations of proposed sites, trails and facilities are subject to change.
Agenda Item 4

Discussion and Direction: Transportation Actions in Plano Tomorrow

DESCRIPTION:

Hold a discussion and provide direction to Freese and Nichols, Inc. regarding transportation-related policies and actions in the Plano Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan.

REMARKS:

Freese and Nichols, Inc. has prepared a list of policies and actions related to transportation from the Plano Tomorrow Comprehensive Plan (see Attachment A). After analyzing the Committee’s responses to the CPRC Kickoff Survey Results (see Attachment B), the consultant team perceives the Committee’s transportation-related comments fall into the following four themes:

1. Land Use/Transportation Relationship
2. Bikes and Transit
3. Walkability and Urban Design
4. Traffic/Congestion Management

In future meetings, Freese and Nichols, Inc. and staff would like to provide additional information related to the Committee’s questions or concerns in the survey for each of the themes and propose modifications to Plan policies, actions, and/or maps, as appropriate.

For this meeting, Daniel Harrison, AICP, of Freese and Nichols, Inc. will lead the Committee in a polling activity and general discussion of these items and seek input on the following:

- Does the Committee agree these are the primary areas of concern related to transportation?
- Does the Committee have any information requests on these items? Are there any speakers the Committee would like to invite to speak on these themes?

RECOMMENDATION:

Recommend the Committee provide direction on the proposed approach and make requests for information related to transportation topics.

ATTACHMENTS:
Attachment A – Transportation Actions in Plano Tomorrow Plan
Attachment B – CPRC Kickoff Survey Results Related to Transportation
Note: The following are the transportation related policies and actions from the Plano Tomorrow Plan.

The Built Environment - Land Use

POLICY - Plano will support a system of organized land use to provide greater housing and employment choices, where new and redevelopment areas respect existing neighborhoods and businesses.

LU3) Review development regulations and implement standards that configure development to provide complementary uses and foster good connections using a combination of streets, trails, and sidewalks for vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle circulation.

The Built Environment - Community Design

POLICY - Plano will promote and incorporate unique and functional community design components within new developments, public spaces, and streetscapes to enrich areas throughout the city, create distinctive visual character, and ensure a citywide pedestrian-friendly environment.

CD3) Create a Corridor Community Design Plan to identify unique streetscape design themes along major arterials.

CD5) Develop wayfinding signage guidelines to apply to special areas and public facilities citywide.

CD6) Evaluate and make revisions to parking regulations to ensure a balance between the needs of various transportation options and creating good community form.

The Built Environment - Transit-Oriented Development

POLICY - Plano will proactively encourage and incentivize development within walking distance of existing and future rail stations or bus transit centers to create an integrated mix of uses including residential, employment, retail, and civic spaces.

TOD1) Develop Criteria for Review of Transit-Oriented Developments and update as necessary.

TOD2) Prioritize and prepare station area plans to guide development patterns within ½ mile of identified transit stations.

TOD3) Rezone property within ½ mile of transit stations to encourage urban design and increase development opportunities.

TOD4) Establish parking maximums in transit-served areas and identified Compact Complete Centers.
TOD5) Develop plans for the K Avenue/DART light rail and the 14th Street/Cotton Belt commuter rail corridors to address redevelopment of retail and multifamily sites and encourage new development around transit stations.

---

**The Built Environment - Roadway System**

**POLICY** - Plano will develop an integrated, multimodal transportation system, through the utilization of technology and innovative concepts that improves the safety and efficiency of the roadway system for all users.

- **RS1)** Develop a transportation plan for Plano that addresses all modes of travel.
- **RS2)** Create an Intelligent Transportation System for Plano’s roadway network.
- **RS3)** Improve intersections of all bicycle trails, pedestrian pathways, and streets for increased visibility, safety, and comfort.
- **RS4)** Review and update roadway standards to accommodate all modes of transportation.
- **RS5)** Develop criteria to assess the effectiveness of pilot projects.
- **RS6)** Identify and improve locations within the city’s transportation infrastructure to meet Americans with Disability Act (ADA) standards.
- **RS7)** Coordinate with neighboring communities to explore regional transportation approaches that improve traffic flow within and between jurisdictions.
- **RS8)** Review and update the Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) threshold for new and redevelopment projects.

---

**The Built Environment - Bicycle**

**POLICY** - Plano will enhance and maintain a safe regional bicycle system to provide a viable option for travel to destinations, which is accessible to all users.

- **B1)** Meet with businesses and share ideas with other cities regarding bicycle transportation.
- **B2)** Adopt a bicycle plan with a target mode share for biking, a safety goal and a target crash reduction.
- **B3)** Create end of trip amenity guidelines, such as bicycle parking and shower facilities to encourage bicycle transportation.
B4) Adopt a Multimodal Streets Ordinance to meet the standards for a Bicycle Friendly Community as determined by the League of American Bicyclists.

B5) Measure the bicycle level of service to evaluate existing routes, prioritize site for improvement, and evaluate alternate treatments.

B6) Collect data to measure and analyze bicycle usage to improve public awareness and safety that will assist in determining and prioritizing necessary improvements.

The Built Environment - Public Transit

POLICY - Plano will provide access to a convenient transit network focused on increased travel options and direct connections to major local destinations.

PT1) Inform and promote Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) services offered in Plano to city residents.

PT2) Develop metrics to measure ridership and to identify service enhancements.

PT3) Increase the number of public transit options throughout all of Plano by working with DART to enhance service provision.

PT4) Study the feasibility and identify the required infrastructure and routes for a Bus Rapid Transit program.

PT5) Work with DART to protect public transit users from weather and vehicular traffic through the installation of transit shelters at service stops.

PT6) Support DART’s efforts to fund development of the Cotton Belt Commuter Rail to provide access to the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport.

PT7) Investigate feasibility of partnerships regarding for the provision of trolley services within major destination areas.

The Built Environment - Transportation Demand Management

POLICY - Plano will utilize Transportation Demand Management to improve air quality, reduce journey to work trips, and mitigate traffic congestion.

TDM1) Partner with the corporate community in Plano to develop and implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan for city.

TDM2) Pursue and develop incentives for businesses to participate in the TDM program.
TDM3) Share ideas, expertise, and knowledge with transportation oriented companies within Plano regarding the city’s transportation planning efforts.

---

**The Built Environment - Pedestrian Environment**

**POLICY** - Plano will pursue a universally accessible and well-connected pedestrian system that promotes walkability, improves navigation of major thoroughfares, and encourages connections between residential areas and neighborhood centers.

PE1) Develop and adopt a pedestrian plan that provides for an accessible, safe system to promote walkability in Plano.

PE2) Foster a streetscape design that includes tree plantings, lighting, street furniture, and wayfinding guides to enhance Plano’s pedestrian environment.

PE3) Implement traffic calming methodologies to reduce traffic speeds and improve pedestrian safety.

PE4) Review feasibility of narrowing intersections on major roadways to improve the safety of crosswalks and reduce the distance pedestrians must travel across streets.

PE5) Identify and complete sidewalk gaps along the city’s roadway system.

PE6) Create Safe Routes to School maps.

PE7) Partner with the public school districts, colleges, and businesses to develop public service announcements that promote pedestrian awareness education.

---

**Regionalism - Population Growth**

**POLICY** - Plano will accommodate regional population growth in identified areas while preserving the suburban character of the community.

PG5) Advocate with the North Central Texas Council of Governments to include increased residential development within developed cities in traffic modeling.
Regionalism – Regional Transportation

**POLICY** - Plano will evaluate regional transportation options with consideration of the impact on existing residential and business development and emphasis on the expansion of transportation choices, traffic demand management, and trip reduction strategies to improve regional mobility.

RT1) Create criteria to evaluate regional transportation projects to determine the impact upon the city and develop solutions to mitigate negative effects.

RT2) Complete all proposed bicycle trail connections with neighboring cities.

RT3) Advocate with Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART) member cities for a second tier membership status for nonmember cities.

RT4) Annually review the city’s transportation plan to ensure consistency with regional transportation agencies’ plans.

RT5) Advocate and support development of the Cotton Belt commuter rail corridor from Plano to the Dallas-Fort Worth International Airport.
2. Having read the Land Use and Community Design component on pages 4-8, are there any policies or actions that concern you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>80%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. I have no concerns at this time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes. Please explain and provide policy abbreviations and action numbers, as appropriate. For example, Community Design (CD1).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure.</td>
<td>1/16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

1. Review and update the Zoning Map to resolve land use inconsistencies between the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map. Each zoning change should be required to go through a formal zoning change request on a parcel by parcel basis. When there is only a small amount of undeveloped land in Plano, each parcel affects nearby properties. The Future land use map is not an acceptable basis for approving zoning changes. Nearby owners should have the right to challenge and object to zoning changes and that is not possible if blanket changes are made. Create regulations that incentivize the redevelopment of underperforming retail and multifamily development. The word incentivize should be replaced with encourage. THis does not need to take taxpayer dollars. TOD Establish parking maximums in transit-served areas and identified Compact Complete Centers. History has proven that inadequate parking results in issues and ultimately requires the city to spend its money building additional parking.

2. What ensures that there would be an system of 'organized' land use?

3. LU Policy - What does it mean to "respect existing neighborhoods and businesses.", LU6 - What types of incentives, LU7 - physical AND historical character, LU9 discussion is critical, CD6 - explain/discuss "good community form", TOD4 - define parking maximums and explain the necessity.

4. In the plan it is stated that 6% of land in Plano is still available for development, but the city will limit it for business or compact complete centers, why is single family homes omitted from the use?

5. These seem to be general and positive statements of direction and they make sense to me.
6. I'm not sure what the future vision for the city is. What would it look like in the future? When the Plano Tomorrow plan was introduced in 2015, it compared Plano in 1985 with Plano in 2015, but didn't provide a vision for Plano 2045 (or even nearer). This should be the starting point for this section. How many people would live here? What would be acceptable density and where? CD1: what are these criteria? How are they developed? Will the development include REAL input from all residents? UL1: what is the process in which the criteria will be developed? The policy is too vague. Will the criteria be subject to ALL residents' input and oversight? TOD1: same comment

7. In TOD3, rezoning property within 1/2 mile of transit stations, what is the impact on existing businesses or residences within that 1/2 mile?

8. Concerned land use would be justification for re-zoning. The transitioning of height standards. None of the specifics are listed. What process would be used to make changes to include citizens? What notification systems would be used to inform citizens? Question viability of pedestrian and bicycle usage. How do we know city-wide goals are consistent with majority of citizens. Who determines land use inconsistencies? In CD section concerned too many taxpayer monies will be involved in incentives. RTC need current and past setbacks. Concerned residential too close to expressways. It’s a quality of life. Unsure of compact complete center UL what are current specifics. What Type of new housing growth. TOD 3 specifics of urban design, TOD 5 question number of multi family size and necessity TOD6 specifics on land banking and ready the environment

9. Action Statement LU9 opens a door to build high density housing units.

10. TOD3) Rezone property within ½ mile of transit stations to encourage urban design and increase development opportunities. - I believe this needs to be looked at more closely and do what makes sense vs. just making a blanket action item

11. Land Use (LU1), Land Use (LU2), Land Use (LU6), Land Use (LU9) Community Development (CD1), Community Development (CD2) Regional Transportation Corridors (RTC1), Regional Transportation Corridors (RTC2), Regional Transportation Corridors (RTC4) Undeveloped Land (UL1), Undeveloped Land (UL3)

12. LU6 - unsure if enough action is be take on this action number
3. Having read the Transportation component on pages 9-13, are there any policies or actions that concern you?

**Comments:**

1. **TOD3)** Rezone property within ½ mile of transit stations to encourage urban design and increase development opportunities. Rezoning should be based upon specific requests. **TOD7)** Prepare developer “Request for Qualifications (RFQ)/Request for Proposals (RFP)” for disposition of city property and include language describing vision, incentives available, and regulatory requirements. Past experience has shown this is a political give away. The city needs to quit wasting taxpayer dollars.

2. **RS4** - Need to accomodate all modes of transportation but focus on maintaining efficiencies for primary modes, **PT5** - How do we prevent use by non-DART users, **TDM Policy** - Define what counts as a "journey to work trip", **PE4** - ???

3. A lot of focus on bicycle trails and accommodations. I don’t see a great deal of residents commuting to work, school or shopping on bicycles, where’s the data that shows that this is a major need in Plano?

4. In theory, I'm in favor of promoting walkability, bicycling and public transportation. In the past, I've lived in a city without owning a car and I loved it. I would prefer NOT to rely on my own car to get around all the time. However, I'm skeptical as to the potential for increased walkability or reliance on public transportation given Plano's layout and given the weather (it's too hot at least 4 months out of the year). Without considering specific proposals, it's hard to say what's possible or not, but that's general concern. As the population ages, I do think we need more options for seniors who can no longer drive.

5. **RS5**: include fiscal considerations. If projects are tax-supported--need broad community support on ballots. **Bx**: Study bike-sharing. Support only if this is a
viable option. Consider experiences and studies in other relevant places PT1: consider fiscal implications and let the residents weigh in.

6. RS2 how do you create an intelligent transportation system when you are adding more residents with inability to add streets and have a bus system that that is not functional. RS4 standards to accommodate all modes of transportation, clarify all modes. B section How can you retrofit major thoroughfares and streets that were never designed to safely accommodate bikes? What bike usage is expected for main transportation especially in summer heat? Costs associated for the plans vs actual usage PT what will cost be to taxpayer vs revenue taken in by DART. Will any plan make DART profitable and not a drain on taxpayers as it is currently? TDM specifics of TDM PE specifics on how you will make crossing major arteries and thoroughfares safe in a city never design for heavy pedestrian traffic

7. Need to address bike components a bit more closely to see if they make sense

8. Public Transit (PT4) Transportation Demand Management (TDM 01) Pedestrian Environment (PE7)

9. Roadway system / Traffic Demand Mgmt- is Plano adequately handling the traffic during rush hours?
5. Having read the Quality of Life component on pages 29-37, are there any policies or actions that concern you?

Comments:

1. PRS5, concerned on this point, explain how you are going to inspect private home structure?
2. Would like to see more attention toward providing emergency shelters where needed for tornado preparation (EM3). Like the idea of expanding library space to offer workshop and meeting space for nonprofits, HOAs, etc. (L7)
3. Make sure that public safety implications of zoning changes are considered. Learn from experiences in other places. Make sure plans and actions don't have adverse safety implications that were not considered initially. PS3: consider input from safety and best practices and experiences when making development decisions. Be PROACTIVE rather than REACTIVE (don't let zoning changes dictate the level of safety) PRSxx: make sure to balance city "looks" with residents' rights for their own property. There is a fine line to walk. SSx: Also consider other districts (e.g., FISD, LISD) within city limits. PR7: consider allowing drones (even if limited to AMA definition of "Park Flyers") operated within AMA regulations. That's part of transportation, and new technology and recreational hobbies should be considered. Is a large kite or sailplane OK because they are not motorized? Are bicycles less dangerous because they don't have motors? What about electric scooters? ALCWx: 24-hour urgent care. Focus on preventative medicine. Fire Chief gave great overview of that at the Plano Citizens Fire Academy. EOx: meeting with the school district(S) more often than once a year (in the past, city leaders/council AVOIDED meeting with the district board). Consider input from them when making planning decisions. What would be the consequences for education? Education is one of the top two (if not top one) reason people move to Plano. Let's keep it that way.
4. In EO5, what does, "evaluate the possibility of sharing facilities..." mean?
5. PR2 will developers pay a fair share for development of additional parks PR5 do other communities have extensive trails to connect
6. The Social Environment - Active Living and Citizen Well-Being - Perhaps look closer at this b/c much of it can be conducted by private sector and not taxpayer dollars. Plano also has a very educated community already.
7. Property Standards - Policy and Action items Social Services (SS2), Social Services (SS4) Parks and Recreation (PR3), Parks and Recreation (PR7) Active Living and Citizen Well-Being - Both policy and Action items Libraries - Both policies and action items Educational Opportunities - Policy and action items
11. Having read the Our Place in the DFW Region component on pages 56-61, are there any policies or actions that concern you?

Comments:

1. I would like to modify the statements on population growth. Preserving the suburban character of Plano is paramount and some of the statements could be taken to promote high density development.

2. I am especially supportive of action statements that support regional sustainability efforts, reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, improve citizen health, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions – all while encouraging a diversified and strong 21st century regional economy. These are important topics that might need additional collaboration across the region to help education citizens on their importance, and the tremendous economic opportunities that are growing with the global transition to a low-carbon 21st market-based economy.

3. "Preserving the suburban character." City leadership / Mayor public communications were inconsistent with this statement. It leads me to believe that the city leadership is not taking its own plan seriously. RT3: make sure we are advocating for pragmatic plans, and consider all consequences. This action statement also uses terminology that is unclear to me. REx: Education comes in at the last page??? Why limit to local and regional universities? Why not beyond? The items are too specific.

4. In RT3, what would "second tier membership status" for non-member cities of DART entail?

5. Concerns with rezoning and making sure we have citizen input. Concerns with DART based on past history AQ4 how feasible is this and at what costs.

6. Policy: what is population goal for the city?
7. Yes - the policy and action items under - Regionalism - Consistency with Neighboring Cities and yes also to Regional Education
8. Population Growth - how are we addressing affordable housing to accommodate pop growth in Plano
14. Do you have any concerns with the other comprehensive plan maps (Bicycle Transportation Map (page 44), Thoroughfare Plan Map (pages 23-24), Park Master Plan Map (page 43), Expressway Corridor Environmental Health Map (pages 25-27))? 

Comments:
1. It should be important to consider more bicycle/pedestrian only crosswalk bridges or tunnels at major traffic intersections (e.g. Preston Road)
2. As noted before, I don't see a large demand for bicycle riding in Plano and would like to see the data on why the city is pushing this.
3. Would just like to say that I consider Plano’s excellent parks a key perk in living here. I use the parks and enjoy them.
4. Same comment as question 12 above.
5. Question bicycle viability, usage and safety
6. I would like to see this improved and better communicated with the neighbors living in these areas, to ensure that the maps reflect the desires of those residents living in these areas, and the overall needs for the city’s development. As well, coordinated with Plano ISD to ensure that it is working for their needs for a healthy city.
15. What do you think is most important for the City to consider when planning for its future growth?

Responses:

1. Maintaining the quality of Plano's suburban character.
2. It's growing diversity people.
3. Planning for evolving transportation patterns and methods as the region continues to grow.
4. Clear over arching direction with allowances for flexibility. Incorporating a variety of perspectives with emphasis on opinions of current residents and businesses.
5. Keep the Plano suburban lifestyle most move here for, limit or eliminate apartments and high density structures from the remaining land and redevelopment.
6. I think that citizens need to realize we can't "just say no" to changes we don't like. Some changes are inevitable. In other cases, saying "no" might yield unintended consequences. If you want to say "no" to something (like apartments) then you need to say what you hope to get, or would accept, instead. We have to deal with reality, not wishful thinking.
7. Maintain its tradition of striving to be the City of Excellence.
8. Start with creating a clear SHARED VISION of ALL residents. Do we all agree with this vision of what the city would look like in 2045? 2035? UNIFY the city instead of adopt a divisive rhetoric. The fact that this is what happens in Washington DC doesn't mean that we should have it here, or that it is a good thing. Start with identifying WHERE WE ARE today. Ignoring the city divide is a mistake. The first step for solving any problem is recognizing that there is one. Once we agree on those, I think we should set the boundaries of getting from where we are today.
9. Maintaining the cities' status as a place where individuals, families and businesses choose to live and work.
10. What do citizens want and need, not developers
11. Listen to the residents in the city.
12. The changing nature of retail business and the space associated with it.
13. How much of the redevelopment is going to be urban planning. Also, how much resources are going to be put into bike plans (overspending to appease a small population). Additionally, ways to make it easier for people to ride DART train.
14. I believe that it is critical that Plano properly balance the needs of the current residents and businesses with the future needs of both. Additionally, we need to better communicate the open avenues for all parties to communicate and have an influence over the decisions that impact them.
15. Developing strategies (actions) that take in consideration of 20 to 30 year trends versus 5 to 10 year trends. Balancing how the city will take care of an aging
population while providing opportunities (e.g., housing, good schools) for younger adults/families
16. What are your thoughts or concerns about density? If any, please explain.

Responses:

1. Plano is largely built out. Plano's development has been highly successful for its suburban character. We should not be trying to change Plano by significantly increasing density. Plano was built for a population of 260,000 but is already at 290,000. If does not have the appropriate infrastructure to accommodate much more growth.

2. None.

3. The city must develop responsibly to balance the needs of current AND future residents.

4. Density changes can alter the character of neighborhoods and should be adopted sparingly.

5. Too many apartments in Plano already that are taxing our infrastructure, police, Fire and schools. More focus on suburban life style and less on trying to reinvent Plano to be an overcrowded urban environment.

6. I think it's a meaningless term that's thrown around to create fear for political purposes. Plano might be denser than the next city — just for example — because our homes are on small lots. So what? Presumably we all knew what size lots we were getting when we bought our homes. If "density" is so bad, is there a level that is OK? I've never heard a number that was "too high" versus one that's "reasonable." It's just 'density bad - dangerous - awful - liberal plot - urbanization! - the end of life as we know it.' Meaningless.

7. Be thoughtful on redevelopment and revitalization. We should seek out lessons learned from other successful cities that have transitioned from new growth to redevelopment growth.

8. I think we are missing metrics and goals for density (as well as other areas in the plan). What should be our density goals in different types of areas? How would you measure "good transportation?"

9. I favor a mix of housing options in the city. I want Plano to be attractive to a diverse community, and that necessitates providing accessible, affordable, convenient places to live.

10. Traffic; we don't have streets to accommodate. First responders. Will not have facilities, staffing to respond and traffic will slow response. We already have larger percentage of apts than Dallas. Used to be 2 or 3 stories now ordinances have changed minimum to 5. Plano was never designed to be a high density urban city. You can’t retrofit it now to be a biking, walking mass transit city. Residents moved here because it is a family oriented suburban city with excellent schools.
Agenda Item 5

Discussion: CPRC Work Plan Updates

DESCRIPTION:

Hold a discussion and make any modifications to the Comprehensive Plan Review Committee (CPRC) Work Plan.

REMARKS:

On January 22, 2020, the Committee adopted a CPRC Work Plan that outlined target dates for discussion of key issues related to density, land use, transportation, growth management, and other unclassified topics. This is intended to be a working document that can be modified as needed.

There are no proposed modifications to the Work Plan at this time. At the conclusion of the meeting, the Committee may request additional modifications as necessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

Consider the CPRC Work Plan and make modifications as necessary.

ATTACHMENTS:

Attachment A – CPRC Work Plan
Items to Consider Throughout the Review Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Be mindful of taxpayers – partner with private companies.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>How to retain existing population and attract new residents.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintain parks and transportation via solid economic development goals and efforts.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Have a plan to prevent crime and support police.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Actions to execute what is in the plan.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The City should move in the same direction of Plano 2045.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The purpose of the comprehensive plan relating to density, land use, growth management, and transportation.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>We all want to live in the best community.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Think about how we deliver the city to future generations.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Strive for factual support.</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education and Training Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Plano Facts and Figures</td>
<td>Jan 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Zoning change notice procedures</td>
<td>Feb 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Executive Session for Legal Advice: Respond to questions and receive legal advice regarding the Fair Housing Act and legal issues related to comprehensive planning</td>
<td>Feb 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Undeveloped Land Map &amp; Population Projections Part 1</td>
<td>Feb 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Active Residential Projects and Population Projections Part 2</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Police Department and Fire-Rescue Facts and Figures</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Future Land Use Plans from Surrounding Cities</td>
<td>Feb 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Review Middle Housing Types</td>
<td>March 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Plano ISD Facts and Figures (Presentation by Plano ISD Superintendent)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>How does DART membership work? How is DART funded? (Survey Question Response)</td>
<td>April 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transportation Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic #</th>
<th>Subtopic Category</th>
<th>Month (Apr-June)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Transit Corridor Densities (Traffic Congestion)</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Discuss how does the plan address traffic congestion? (Survey)</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Land Use/Transportation Nexus or Relationship</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Discuss modes of transportation and appropriateness in locations</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Discuss and understand how transit impacts the community</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>Discuss how biking is not feasible right now – e.g., people can’t bike to work</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Discuss the level of maintenance required for various roadways long-term. (Survey)</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Traffic Analysis Process / Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA)</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Define what counts as a “journey to work trips” related to transportation demand management.</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>What is the process in which the criteria (i.e., the development criteria to review undeveloped land – Page 7 of 58 adoption ord.) will be developed?</td>
<td>Apr 21; May 5 &amp; 19; June 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Future Land Use Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic #</th>
<th>Subtopic Category</th>
<th>Month (June-July)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Land Use Compatibility</td>
<td>June 16 &amp; 30; July 7 &amp; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Discuss what “incentivize” means and prefer not to use monetary incentives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Define incentives to not burden the taxpayers – it is okay to maintain aging infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhood Center Concept</td>
<td>June 16 &amp; 30; July 7 &amp; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Discuss concepts to address aging neighborhoods / protect neighborhoods from declining</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Four corner retail centers need to change / purposeful planning for retail corners can have a positive impact on taxes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Map Revision</td>
<td>June 16 &amp; 30; July 7 &amp; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>We need to define what we will look like in the future.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Development review and approval criteria</td>
<td>June 16 &amp; 30; July 7 &amp; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>How does the implementation of these processes affect the effectiveness of a plan? (Survey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mixed Use composition (type and density)</td>
<td>June 16 &amp; 30; July 7 &amp; 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>Evaluate the changing nature of the retail business and the space associated with it. (Survey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Density (Housing) Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtopic #</th>
<th>Subtopic Category</th>
<th>Month (Part 1: Jan-Apr)</th>
<th>Month (Part 2: Aug-Sept)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Density (Establish an understanding of density.)</td>
<td>Jan 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Review of the vision statement</td>
<td>Jan 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Consensus of the work plan</td>
<td>Jan 22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Plano Facts and Figures</td>
<td>Jan 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Density</td>
<td>Definition and metrics</td>
<td>Jan 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>Homework Assignment</td>
<td>Photos of desirables housing types for Plano</td>
<td>Jan 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Housing Types (Goal: Establish the “menu options” and not location.)</td>
<td>Feb 4 &amp; 20; Mar 3 &amp; 18; Apr 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Have areas to draw young people / more walkable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>Housing affordability/attainability – e.g., some people need to live outside of the city when they work in Plano.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>What does mixed use mean? (repeated 3 times)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d</td>
<td>Density is going to increase traffic, overcrowd schools, and reduce quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>How do we address aging neighborhoods and their preservation? (Survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Housing Mix (Goal: Address how housing types relate to each other in the same development and neighboring development.)</td>
<td>Feb 4 &amp; 20; Mar 3 &amp; 18; Apr 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Define what suburban development looks like.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Discuss mixed use criteria and what does it mean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>Use the phrase “attainable housing” because young people and workers should be able to live in Plano.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d</td>
<td>Do not “urbanize” Plano, we don’t want to be Uptown Dallas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Plano will NOT be one of the largest communities in Collin County in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtopic #</td>
<td>Subtopic Category</td>
<td>Month (Sept-Oct)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>How to Manage Growth</td>
<td>Sept 29; Oct 6 &amp; 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>Consistent growth / success for city. e.g., should have downfall for of success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>Continue to strengthen economic development efforts to attract businesses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>We are in a transition from bedroom community to be more urban, we need to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>continue making this a great community to live, work, play, and learn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1d</td>
<td>Be proactive with managing the growth because we can’t control what is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coming in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Population Projections</td>
<td>Sept 29; Oct 6 &amp; 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>The City’s population projections. (Survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>How do the population projections inform the plan and development of the City?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Redevelopment and revitalization</td>
<td>Sept 29; Oct 6 &amp; 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Be thoughtful on redevelopment and revitalization. (Survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>Seek out lessons learned from successful cities that have transitioned from new</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>growth to redevelopment growth. (Survey)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Review of the vision statement</td>
<td>Sept 29; Oct 6 &amp; 20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>