

Public Comment re: City of Gaithersburg Transportation
draft 7/22/2010

My family moved to Gaithersburg in 1964. I left as a young adult but returned a year and half ago to take care of my elderly parents who have lived here continuously for ~45 years. I use Metro, RideOn buses, I drive, and I bicycle. I have a wide perspective when it comes to transportation in Gaithersburg both in time, in location comparing Gaithersburg to other localities, and in mode.

I've read your Master Plan for Gaithersburg (draft 7/22/2010) and was quite pleasantly surprised to find that Gaithersburg was using Toole Design Group to create an improved bikeway since they are considered the best in the business. I am highly supportive of the bicycle improvement projects I see listed here but I wonder if there are others that Toole suggested that are not listed and how I might find out about them.

I agree whole heartedly that signage is incredibly important, striping is incredibly important and "physical improvements are *key* to making the urban bicycle network more inviting." It's a lot easier for a car driver to recognize and accept the right of a bicyclist to be on the road if that bicyclist has his or her own lane. It doesn't do me any good to have the legal right to a lane on any road with a speed limit of 50mph or less (when it is too narrow to accommodate my bike, a 3' buffer, and a car) if I'm lying dead in a ditch. You realize that law applies to Route 355. Now there's a nightmare scenario.

I would suggest that any thoroughfare (arterials and collectors) should have a bikeway very visibly marked with both striping and signage and dividers. The dividers can be the plastic kind that bend over. They don't have to go the entire length of the roadway but just install them initially from every intersection for about 10-20' to give the car drivers the message that this line is real and needs to be respected. Ideally, I would prefer all thoroughfares to have a permanent, hard, separated bike lane. But I seriously doubt that that would ever happen.

I see that you have a problem with roads that are not meeting their 1450 CLV and I was wondering, are bicycles considered vehicles? The police consider my bike a vehicle. The vehicle codes consider my bike a vehicle. Does the planning and transportation board? If you were to build bikelanes along all those failing CLVs, would that solve your problem for 10-25% of the cost?

This is not meant as a smart aleck way to get around the rules. I'm serious. You have a budget problem, a congestion problem, and according to this report, you also have a ridership problem compared to the rest of Montgomery County (pg 18). In the United

States most car trips (besides work or vacation) are short, around town, 1-3 mile trips. I myself have to decide whether I'd rather sit in traffic every time I need to run over to Trader Joes for something I've forgotten or risk my life on my bike. I'd prefer to ride my bike in any but the worst weather. But not if I'm likely to die in the process. The time in transit is the same. Really, it takes the exact same amount of time. But one method is far scarier. And I'm a dedicated cyclist.

I think you would reduce a lot of traffic in Gaithersburg if you put in a network of paths (that are different than sidewalks) that took people to places they wanted to go (you do have some paths that are just head scratchers) and then gave them bike racks they can lock up to (Gaithersburg really needs more bike racks). I think if you did some minor research, you would find that every municipality that substantially increased its bike facilities saw a drop in congestion. I bet if you called up the League of American Bicyclists they could provide you with some data on that. Or ask Toole.

On page 14 you state that "Public transit is the foremost alternative to the automobile." For whom, going where? And you want to negotiate with RideOn to bring back some routes. I don't want to discourage you from trying to bring back RideOn routes but have you even considered all the lower income people who live and work in Gaithersburg and for whom buying a bicycle is their first opportunity at independent transportation? I think you have an underserved population of commuters who are unlikely to stand up and be vocal about their need for a safe bicycle commuting network. I think you owe it to your residents, all of your residents, to provide for all of their commuting needs. I think you consider public transit to be the foremost alternative to the automobile because you are looking at what is currently the case, a situation in which your own report declares that there are "minimal bicycle and pedestrian facilities (pg20)." Using the bad prioritizing of the past to justify continued skewed prioritizing doesn't make much sense to me. It seems to me that there are quite a number of different ways to justify a small (relatively speaking) outlay for bike and pedestrian infrastructure to get a big bang for your transportation buck.

If you are serious about a comprehensive network of bicycle paths, I suspect that you will see bike ridership skyrocket (health improve, maintenance costs per capita decrease; again ask Toole and/or the League). Minneapolis Minn. saw this happen. They had unimpressive ridership numbers until they put in the Greenway and now they beat Copenhagen in both days of nasty weather and bicycle commuting numbers. Did you know that home values increase the nearer a house is to a bike path (the kind in a park). Studies in Indiana proved that a comparable house within I think .5 mi to a park bike path sold for 11% more during the same season. There are a lot of reasons why you should put in more bicycle and pedestrian friendly facilities, but I want to shift focus now on what does and does not qualify as bike/pedestrian friendly.

First of all, I understand that it is legal to ride a bike on a sidewalk in Gaithersburg. And believe me I love doing this, especially at traffic lights. The light isn't going my way? Fine. I can jump on the sidewalk and cross with the peds. But as a pedestrian, I hate being buzzed by a bike. When car drivers do a quick scan to make sure it's clear before pulling into a strip mall, they are not looking for bicyclists that are moving significantly faster than pedestrians. And the car driver feels tricked because they looked, darn it! I have seen this precise accident on 355 in Gaithersburg. The car driver looked as though she was beating herself up as badly as the bicyclist was injured.

These are all very different modes of transportation and they should be given their own space and protected from each other. If someone on a bike knocked over my Mom on the sidewalk, that would be another hip surgery and months in Rehab. There is nothing safe about mixing pedestrians with bicyclists and expecting fast moving cars to cross that path safely. That's why it is illegal to ride your bike on the sidewalk in most places and I know people who have gotten \$250 tickets for it. But that's in a town where pedestrian rights are respected, and roads are clearly marked for bicycle use. You can get a ticket for jaywalking but a car driver *on the other side of an intersection* can get a ticket for even edging their car into the crosswalk *diagonally opposite* the pedestrian. That would never happen in Gaithersburg. The culture here is different. That is why a separate bike path network would be the best option for all concerned.

Even so, I applaud this new master plan with its specifics about improving the bicycling facilities. Requiring big trucks to park 25" away from an intersection (31) is really smart. It's incredibly hard to find out if another car is coming if you can't see around them until you are already getting run over by it. But Master Plans that are not built are useless. Facilities that are built and not maintained become dangerous (and what is the system for reporting these?). And police that do not recognize transportation rights other than a driver's create dangerous situations. What good does a stripe do me if I get run off the road and the cops don't care?

Comments on the Gaithersburg Transportation Plan

Page 2

2. Introduction

The plan needs a more visionary, goal oriented introduction. This introduction sounds like it was written in 1980. Transportation planning as efficient movement of vehicles has become obsolete. A plan for the 21st century expresses goals of sustainability, mobility by many modes of travel, and streets that serve purposes beyond vehicle travel – the new concept of “complete streets”.

The beginning of this plan sounds like a blueprint for an expanding suburb, whereas most of Gaithersburg is more or less developed. What is needed is facilities and services and efficient use of current infrastructure to enable the transition to a system for an urbanizing area. Gaithersburg badly needs its urban corridors to function better without adding pavement or car trips, even as the urban areas continue to redevelop. Reading through the plan, one infers that no new major roads or even widening of major roads are anticipated. That means this increased travel must be accommodated mainly by other modes sharing the roads we already have.

Aspects of this transition are included in the body of the plan document, but the reader would not know it from the first part of the Introduction. Even the term “multimodal” (Page 3) has been corrupted by applying it to highways like the ICC, as a “greenwash” while avoiding a basic policy change.

Yet this plan includes ambitious schemes for networks of transit and bikeways. These facilities, if built, would provide a good foundation for the transition to an efficient, sustainable transport system. These features should be stressed as the vision tying all these facilities and actions together into a unified plan.

Page 4

3. 1. Hierarchy of Streets

Delete or rewrite the introduction to this section. Delete the first sentence about the primacy of the automobile. The street system provides the framework for the transport system, but its function goes far beyond movement of automobiles. The introduction to this section should stress the many functions of the road system, including their “community building” function in urbanized areas, tying together the businesses on each side of urban corridors, residents to local stores or recreation places, etc. without the constant need for a car for all trips.

Page 6

The road categories are confusing. I don’t understand the two systems of classification. I perceive, however, that the categories need to be updated to include more urban road types. For example, the class called Major Arterial includes Great Seneca Highway *and* Frederick Avenue as the same road type. Yet functionally they are entirely different. The code badly needs to add a classes for urban boulevards, and maybe lower volume urban streets as well. Montgomery In the White Flint plan, Montgomery County introduced a street type in which bicycles and cars are accommodated equally.

Page 14

The Transit section contains many excellent new and enhanced facilities and services. But again, the introduction needs to stress the enhanced role of transit in the city's future transport system. Either here or in the introduction, the goal of increased transit mode share should be expressed directly. Page 15 should include discussion of the importance of Metro, and stress better non-driver access to the Shady Grove station. It should advocate that all Metro trains to run to Shady Grove.

Gaithersburg officials have never expressed the importance of the Frederick Avenue/ MD 355 Corridor of the City's and County's Main Street. There are excellent ideas for enhancing transit along this corridor, but they should be linked as aspects of enhancing that central corridor.

I am pleased that the plan supports Bus Rapid Transit all along MD 355, which coordinates Gaithersburg with the Shady Grove Sector Plan and Rockville's plan for its central corridor. I like the plan's reference to such a BRT as a CCT for the eastern side of the City. I am also pleased to see support for MARC's expansion plan. These facilities will be essential in the future as alternatives to Metrorail, as it nears its ultimate capacity.

Page 22

The discussion of Route 355 should stress its overall role as the main street for the whole County, and need to enhance Gaithersburg's part of it, in particular with more efficient transit service. The BRT proposal should be applied in the Route 355 corridor section as well as in the transit section.

Page 23

Stress the urgency to make the Commercial District more accessible by pedestrians and cyclists. There was a plan for doing this that included charettes – what happened to that plan?

Page 24

The section on the Southern Residential District is adequate, though I dispute the statement that the "district functions well", except for cars. The Frederick Avenue sidewalks do not function well for the rather frequent cyclists. This section like that farther north has substantial pedestrian traffic, insecure sidewalks, few crosswalks, and high speed car traffic. It needs a more urban treatment that slows traffic, similar to the plan for the Shady Grove sector and the commercial part of Gaithersburg. I appreciate the repetition of the need for a BRT right of way.

Page 27

5. Traffic Mitigation Strategies

This section needs a better title, since it includes major transit facilities whose importance exceeds traffic mitigation. Perhaps the transit discussion should be incorporated into the Transit section, and this section devoted to the standard traffic mitigation activities. Traffic mitigation should stress non-road methods like carpool programs, Metro shuttle buses, subsidizing transit etc. The transportation facility portion of development plans should include standards for peak hour car trip reduction, as do County plans for urbanized areas.

Page 34

7. Policy Objectives

This section seems misplaced at the end of the plan. It contains too many similar recommendations; that can add confusion in implementing the policies. Objective 1 seems out of date. Objectives 2 and 3 are good, but should be more prominent in the plan.

From: [Britta Monaco](#)
To: [Rob Robinson](#)
Cc: [Doris Stokes](#)
Subject: FW: Transportation Element in the Gaithersburg Master Plan
Date: Monday, August 16, 2010 7:53:57 AM

The attached came in to the City Hall e-mail box at 4:25 on Friday, 8/13.

-----Original Message-----

From: Richard Lindstrom [<mailto:dick.lindstrom@gmail.com>]
Sent: Friday, August 13, 2010 4:25 PM
To: CityHall External Mail; Sidney Katz; Ryan Spiegel
Cc: fenimori@erols.com; alan_migdall@yahoo.com
Subject: Transportation Element in the Gaithersburg Master Plan

Comments on Transportation Element of 2009 [sic] Gaithersburg Master Plan

Richard M. Lindstrom, 13 August 2010

These comments refer specifically to the bicycle and pedestrian portions of the Plan, in line with the goal stated on p. 3: "Constructing and maintaining a safe and convenient bicycle and pedestrian network. "

I agree with others that this draft element lacks a vision of what Gaithersburg could and should be, both in absolute terms and in comparison with other jurisdictions in Montgomery County, the United States, and abroad.

It is pointed out on page 3 that "the current transportation within the City is already congested." On p. 4 the Plan says "The automobile is generally accepted to be the primary mode of choice for travel." Indeed it is, but it need not be. There are few realistic options for changing the present road and rail layouts, so that alternatives need to be made more attractive. Biking and walking are the easiest alternatives to encourage.

It is in fact not well known that "Gaithersburg has a well developed network of existing bikeways, consisting primarily of off-road facilities, such as the sidepaths and low volume residential streets that can be used as shared use roadways," as stated on p. 18. Table 3 shows 30.7 miles of off-road facilities, but none of this is marked on site nor are maps made available for users. Appropriate signage and publicity should be implemented; this can be done with little cost.

The map on p. 27 shows that most "approved bike-ped facilities" are sidewalks. I have been told that the Gaithersburg statute does not permit bikes on sidewalks, although Montgomery County does. The City attorney and police should clarify this issue, and publicize the facts.

Text in the Plan on p. 29 is repeated from p. 18: "In March 2007, the City of Gaithersburg initiated a planning process to develop a Bikeway Improvement Plan with consultant Toole Design Group to incorporate in the 2009 Transportation Element."

On p. 31, replace the recommendation "The delineated routes for safe

bicycle and pedestrian circulation should be included as part of any directional signage application or pavement marking and signage plan " with "Install signage to inform users of delineated routes for safe bicycle and pedestrian circulation."

Add a recommendation "Publicize alternate non-auto means of transportation."

Finally, members should be appointed the Transportation Advisory Committee, and that committee should be actively involved in all decisions related to transportation.



Gaithersburg

A CHARACTER COUNTS!

CITY OF GAITHERSBURG
MINUTES OF A REGULAR CITY COUNCIL MEETING
MONDAY, JULY 19, 2010

A meeting of the Mayor and City Council was called to order at 7:30 p.m., Mayor Katz presiding. Council Members present: Ashman, Drzyzgula, Marraffa, Sesma and Spiegel. Staff present: City Manager Jones, Assistant City Manager Tomasello, Finance and Administration Director Belton, Planning and Code Administration Director Ossont, Public Works Director Arnoult, Parks, Recreation and Culture Director Potter, Special Events Director Limmer, Community Services Program Manager Herndon, Director of Community & Public Relation Director Monaco, Information Technology Director Cottrell, Comptroller Smith, City Attorney Board and Municipal Clerk Stokes.

I. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge was led by Charles Ferrell, Gaithersburg resident.

II. INVOCATION

In lieu of an invocation, Mayor Katz called for a moment of silence.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion was made by Council Member Spiegel, seconded by, Council Member Marraffa, that the minutes of the Mayor and Council regular meeting held June 7, 2010, be approved with correction.

Vote: 5-0

IV. APPOINTMENTS

A. Resolution of the City Council Confirming Reappointments by the Mayor to the Animal Control Board, the Art in Public Places Committee, the Arts and Monuments Funding Corp., Inc., the Commission on Landlord/Tenant Affairs, the Community Advisory Committee, the Educational Enrichment Committee, the Environmental Affairs Committee, the Gaithersburg/Washington Grove Fire Department, and the Police Chief's Advisory Committee

This resolution confirmed the following reappointments: Animal Control Board, Robert H. Moore, 7 Montgomery Avenue, 20877, three-year term; Art in Public Places Committee, Judy Gross, 446 Tschiffely Square Road, 20878, two-year term; Arts and Monuments Funding Corp., Inc., Toni Lieberman, 18 Apricot Court, 20878 and Julius J. Persensky, 116 Summit Hall Road, 20877, two-year terms; Commission on Landlord/Tenant Affairs, Jean Noah, 313 Main Street, 20878, three-year term; Community Advisory Committee, Julius J. Persensky, 116 Summit Road, 20877, two-year term; Educational Enrichment Committee, CDR James M. Simpson, 1349 Carlsbad Drive, 20879, two-year term; Environmental Affairs Committee, CDR James M. Simpson, 1349 Carlsbad Drive, 20879, two-year term; Gaithersburg/Washington Grove Fire Department, Bob Drzyzgula, 16 Walker Avenue, 20877 and Richard Knoebel, 202 Rolling Road, 20877, one-year terms; and the Police Chief's Advisory Committee, Charles Ferrell, 227 Rolling Road, 20877 and Doty Virginia Drive, 20877, two-year terms.

XI. POLICY DISCUSSION AND STAFF GUIDANCE**A. MP-1-10, Resolution of the Mayor and City Council Adopting the Transportation Element Amendment to the General Plan for the City of Gaithersburg Master Plan**

Planning and Code Administration Director Ossont stated that due to comments received from the public, if revisions are necessary to the draft Element and resolution, the Mayor and City Council can conduct the policy discussion and staff will bring it back to the next regular meeting for a vote. It was suggested to reopen the record for a period of time to allow public input because of the recent revisions.

Planner Robinson presented the revised resolution and Element incorporating the changes and comments from the Mayor and City Council, Planning Commission, Maryland Department of Transportation and the Maryland-National Capital Park & Planning Commission. He added that the Planning Commission approved MP-1-10 on June 16, 2010 by resolution PCR-3-10 and recommended adoption of the same by the Mayor and City Council. It was noted that several emails from the public were received after the closing of the record and will become part of the record, if the Mayor and City Council voted to reopen the record.

Support was expressed with Objective 3 in the draft Element stating the continued support of the Corridor Cities Transitway (CCT) with the Kentlands and Crown Farm realignments and endorse light rail transit (LRT) as the preferred mode option for CCT. Staff was directed to reiterate their position. In addition, the following concerns and direction was given to staff: highlight as new material, Section 5, traffic mitigation strategies; remove the envisioned CLV standard number of 1600 from footnote 10 on pg. 14; concern expressed about the suggestion that new commercial properties have more access from the side streets rather than MD 355; concern with map on page 24, footnote 21, Appendix B representing typical conditions be revised or deleted, narrative explanation suggested with map, staff to work with Public Works to modify language; and on page 31 improve language for directional signage and painted markings not just for vehicles, but for pedestrians and bicycle circulation and connectivity routes, a separate bullet for signage was suggested.

Motion was made by Council Member Sesma, seconded by, Council Member Marraffa, to reopen the record on MP-1-10.

Vote: 5-0

Motion was made by Council Member Sesma, seconded by, Council Member Drzyzgula, that the record on MP-1-10 be held open until August 13, 2010, 5 p.m.

Vote: 5-0

MEMORANDUM TO: Mayor and City Council

VIA: Angel L. Jones, City Manager

FROM: Rob Robinson, Planner

DATE: August 13, 2010

SUBJECT: Recommended changes to the February 17, 2010 draft Transportation Element of the 2009 Master Plan for the City of Gaithersburg

On February 17, 2010, staff released MP-1-10, the draft Transportation Element of the 2009 Master Plan update, for the required 60 day public comment period. A joint public hearing before the Mayor & City Council and Planning Commission was held May 17, 2010. On May 24, 2010, the Mayor and City Council and Planning Commission held a Joint Work Session on the Municipal Growth Element. While both the Mayor and City Council and Planning Commission records were open, staff received public comments from a variety of public agencies, the Mayor and City Council, and the Planning Commission.

In response to the comments received, staff revised the draft element and documented all changes in a memo to the Planning Commission dated June 11, 2010 (attached). The Planning Commission approved MP-1-10 on June 16, 2010 by resolution PCR-3-10 and recommended adoption of the same by the Mayor and City Council.

The Mayor and City Council held a policy discussion on July 19, 2010. During the discussion the Council directed staff to further revise the draft document with additional changes. The following summarizes the proposed additional changes to the February 17, 2010 draft Element per the staff guidance received during the Mayor and City Council policy discussion held on July 19, 2010:

- **Page 14:** Footnote #10- “the plan envisions a standard of 1600 subject to further action on Montgomery County’s Growth Policy.” deleted from footnote
- **Page 31:** Third bullet, added “and provides circulation among the various businesses or properties served by the lots.”
- **Page 31:** Added new fourth bullet; “The delineated routes for safe bicycle and pedestrian circulation should be included as part of any directional signage application or pavement marking and signage plan.”
- **Page 44-45:** Appendix B- revised the diagram and added the following text: “The preceding conceptual diagrams illustrate how the use of context sensitive design

techniques can enhance safety and function along MD 355. Redevelopment should include the consolidation of both lots and driveways. These new coupled/shared driveways, serving multiple parcels, should be sited to align across from existing side streets wherever feasible to facilitate potential new traffic signals. Other shared driveways from MD 355 should be designed as “right-in/ right-outs” when additional access points are available from side streets. New construction should be sited to the fronts of lots or roads so orientation and access for both pedestrians and bicyclists is from MD 355. Parking lots should be sited in the rear of lots and shared among multiple properties. These parking lots should be linked together and connected to the shared driveways through the use of “alley” drive aisles. These “alleys” have a design similar to a dedicated roadway rather than an undefined aisle. These techniques will allow for fewer conflict points along MD 355 with the reduction of driveways; will decrease “short” trip traffic on MD 355 as connections between properties will be available using the rear lot “alleys”; will restrict left turning movements onto MD 355 from properties by redirecting traffic to signalized intersections; and will facilitate an enhanced streetscape that is conducive for pedestrian and bicycle use by orientating the buildings fronting MD 355. An additional benefit of a better functioning MD 355 will be the reduced inclination to use residential side streets as “cut-throughs” to reach destinations and avoid traffic.”

RESOLUTION NO. _____

RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
ADOPTING THE TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT
AMENDMENT TO THE GENERAL PLAN
FOR THE CITY OF GAITHERSBURG MASTER PLAN

AS APPROVED AND RECOMMENDED BY
THE PLANNING COMMISSION ON JUNE 16, 2010

AS ADOPTED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL ON SEPTEMBER 7, 2010

WHEREAS, Section 3.05 of Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland sets forth the function and duty of the Planning Commission to make and approve a general plan or amendments thereto and recommend same to the local legislative body for adoption, to serve as a guide to public and private actions and decisions to ensure the logical development of public and private property in appropriate relationships; and

WHEREAS, as codified in Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland, the General Plan, at a minimum, is required to contain goals, objectives, principles, policies, and standards, which shall serve as a guide for the development and economic and social well-being of the local jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, Section 3.08 of Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland states that the local legislative body shall adopt the plan and or amendment thereto, and

WHEREAS, Section 3.05(a)(4)(i) of Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland sets forth that the General Plan must include "A statement of goals and objectives, principles, policies, and standards, which shall serve as a guide for the development and economic and social well-being of the local jurisdiction"; and

WHEREAS, Section 3.05(a)(4)(iii) of Article 66B of the Annotated Code of Maryland sets forth that the General Plan must include a Transportation Element; and

WHEREAS, the City has drafted a Transportation Element, dated February 17, 2010 and entered into the record as Exhibit 1, that was the subject of a joint Planning Commission and Mayor and City Council public hearing on May 17, 2010 (MP-1-10) and joint Planning Commission and Mayor and City Council work session on May 24, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission approved Resolution No. PCR-3-10 on June 16, 2010, being the approval of a master plan amendment entitled the Transportation Element and transmitted an attested copy of the same and a copy of the June 17, 2010 Communication: Planning Commission as its recommendation to the Mayor and City Council, which is hereby attached and incorporated as part of this resolution; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and Council discussed the aforementioned Transportation Element and the Planning Commission recommendation (PCR-3-10) during its regular meetings held on July 19, 2010 and September 7, 2010; and

WHEREAS, the General Plan and amendments made from time to time provide a general framework for assisting the Mayor and City Council and City Planning Commission in making land use policy and facilities decisions:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and City Council that the Master Plan Amendment MP-1-10, the Transportation Element amendment to the General Plan, thoroughly reviewed by the legislative body during the joint public hearing conducted on May 17, 2010 and the joint work session on May 24, 2010; approved by the City Planning Commission on June 16, 2010 (as PCR-3-10); and recommended to the legislative body in a Communication: Planning Commission, dated June 17, 2010, is hereby adopted by the Mayor and City Council as an amendment to the General Plan for the City, the 2009 City of Gaithersburg Master Plan Transportation Element, as heretofore amended.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all other recommendations of the City Planning Commission, as documented in Exhibit 27 (June 17, 2010 Communication: Planning Commission) and Exhibit 23 (Memorandum of changes to the initial draft Element entered into the record as Exhibit 1), pursuant to the adoption of PCR-3-10; and the further revisions recommended by the Mayor and City Council as documented in Exhibit 49 (Memorandum of changes to the initial draft Element entered into the record as Exhibit 1) are hereby approved and ratified to the extent not inconsistent with this Resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that maps and illustrative material may be revised where necessary to conform to City Council actions. The text may be revised as necessary to achieve clarity and consistency and to convey the actions of the City Council.

ADOPTED by the City Council this 7th day of September, 2010.

Sidney A. Katz, Mayor and
President of the Council

THIS IS TO CERTIFY that the foregoing Resolution was adopted by the City Council on the 7th day of September, 2010.

Angel L. Jones, City Manager