

Comments on Highway One Safety and Mobility Study Phase 2

November 2011 Draft

by Lennie Roberts, Committee for Green Foothills

Introduction, top of page 3: in the top paragraph (continuing from previous page) the statement is made: “The entire study area is within the jurisdiction of the California Coastal Commission”. This is incorrect. The Coastal Commission has appeals jurisdiction, and possibly direct jurisdiction over areas that have been retained such as Pillar Point Marsh. Jurisdiction over the study area is mostly San Mateo County, with a small strip within the City of Half Moon Bay.

Introduction, top of page 3: Reference is made to the Rancho Corral de Tierra property as soon becoming part of the GGNRA, managed by the NPS. That transfer has now happened, and that info should be updated here and throughout the Study.

Introduction, page 3: second complete paragraph describes Average Daily Traffic (ADT). What are traffic volumes during peak commute hours? This information would better describe existing conditions, and would be consistent with LCP Policies 2.48.b and 2.49.

Introduction, page 3: third complete paragraph (and elsewhere in the Study) makes reference to “new tunnels and a bridge”. More precisely, there is a single tunnel with two bores, and two bridges spanning Shamrock Valley.

Introduction, page 3: last paragraph, makes reference to “a recently approved new office park and wellness center” as having potential to increase traffic. The referenced project has been appealed to the Coastal Commission, and its EIR challenged in court; it is not known at this time whether this project will be approved. The study should clarify that the project was locally approved but is under review by the Coastal Commission and the courts.

Introduction, page 4: second paragraph, add “during the week” after “commuters”.

Introduction, page 4: last paragraph, first sentence references a continuous parallel multi-modal trail from the City of Half Moon Bay to the City of Pacifica. This is incorrect. The limits of the parallel multi-modal trail are from the southern end of Half Moon Bay to the northern end of Montara. The second sentence, which says the trail would run “predominately” on the east side of State Route 1, should be clarified to include the purpose of the parallel trail which is to enable residents of the Midcoast area (most of whom live on the east side of State Route 1) to walk or bicycle to school, neighborhood services, and/or jobs without having to cross the highway. There do not appear to be any significant impediments to locating the trail on the east side of the highway throughout the study area, but more detailed studies are needed as to whether it would impact sensitive habitats, measures to avoid

those impacts, and how safety concerns regarding crossing local streets can be addressed.

Highway One Characteristics, page 9: states that California statute designates State Route 1 from Higgins-Purissima Road south of the City of Half Moon Bay to I-280 as an Expressway. This designation is inconsistent with Coastal Act Section 30254, which states that Highway One shall remain a “scenic two-lane road” in rural areas. Thus, between the urban/rural boundary at the northern urban limit line of Montara and the southern urban limit of Pacifica at Linda Mar, State Route 1 is limited to two lanes. The Study should clarify that the Coastal Act will not allow expansion of State Route 1 into an expressway in the rural area north of Montara. The first sentence on page 12 should be similarly corrected.

Community Fringes, page 12, should point out the existence of the permanent urban/rural boundary at the northern end of Montara, where the urban pattern of development suddenly changes to rural agriculture and open space uses.

Pedestrian and Bikeway Network, Highway 1, page 22, recommends a minimum 6 foot wide paved shoulder for bicyclists and pedestrians where there is no sidewalk. A Class 2 Bike Lane only needs to be 5 feet wide, if there is no curb. Widening could encourage illegal parking on the paved shoulder or unsafe passing by vehicles on the right. It would be preferable to designate and sign the 5 foot wide Bike Lane.

Map of Pedestrian and Bikeway Network: Moss Beach to Pillar Point Harbor, page 26, should be revised to:

- a. Include the new parking lot just north of the Mobile Home Park and industrial buildings on Airport Street and the Jean Lawler trail connection to the Coastal Trail that was constructed by POST.
- b. The “Parallel Trail Route Connector” depicted along Bernal Avenue in Seal Cove extending across private property to Airport Street should be deleted, as it would duplicate the POST parking area and Jean Lauer trail, and require crossing significant wetlands and a pond.
- c. The trail along Airport Street is considered part of the Coastal Trail, not the Parallel Trail, and its reference should be corrected on the Map. (n.b., the Big Wave Project on Airport Street, approved by San Mateo County, and appealed to the Coastal Commission, would be required to construct a segment of the Coastal Trail along its Airport Street frontage and allocate a portion of its parking areas for beach parking.)
- d. Other “Parallel Trail Route Connectors” shown west of State Route 1 (along Marine Blvd, Cypress Ave. and Virginia Ave, Stanford Ave, Cornell Ave. etc.) should be changed to “Coastal Trail/Parallel Trail Route Connectors”.

- e. The Potential Alternative Parallel Trail alignment shown along the west side of State Route 1 at the Half Moon Bay Airport should be deleted. The purpose of the Parallel Trail is to enable people who live on the east side of State Route 1 to walk or bicycle north and south without having to cross the highway. There is sufficient room along the east side of the highway for the trail in this area.

Focus Area Design Proposals, Etheldore Street Option B, page 60, has a note at the bottom of the illustration. The final sentence says “further study would be required to assess potential constraining factors on site development, such as the proximity of San Vicente Creek, ...” This sentence should also include the possible presence of wetlands.

Appendix Action Plan on pages A-4 and A-5, lists Proposed Design Improvements, Lead Agency/Partner, and Action for various elements. It should be noted in this table that an early evaluation of plan elements is important to ensure conformity with the certified San Mateo County Local Coastal Program (LCP), particularly its sensitive habitats and agriculture policies. For example, widening of the existing highway, and/or creation of roundabouts could impact sensitive habitats, including wetlands, riparian areas, and habitats for listed species. The location of parking lots/trailheads could potentially have similar impacts, and/or could impact prime agricultural lands. As a specific example, on page A-24, in the first complete paragraph, the notes state that “fallow agricultural lands” might provide an opportunity for a trailhead. If these fallow lands consist of prime soils, they should not be considered for parking and trailhead unless there are no alternative (non-prime soils) sites available. Parking areas/trailheads also should be carefully evaluated for compliance with sensitive habitat and visual resources policies.