

3/9/2012

Steve,

I'm forwarding a few more specific comments and questions about the Traffic & Trails Study. Many came from Christine's close reading of the plan. We hope you'll find these helpful as you move forward. Also attached are comments Ken Hibbits sent Nancy Hornor following the meeting last week in case he didn't send them to you directly. We think these have merit.

Congratulations on getting the study to this point. Let us know how we can be a good partner in this endeavor.

Thanks.

Brian

Brian A. Aviles, Senior Planner  
National Park Service - Golden Gate National Recreation Area  
Building 201, Fort Mason, San Francisco, CA 94123

---

1. What type of quantitative data was collected along the corridor aside from ADT? Any turning movements? Bicycle and pedestrian counts? Collision data? Speeds? The study has qualitative discussions and cites neighbor perceptions, but does not indicate quantitative data was collected. Although the proposed design concepts reflect some of the best tools in the toolbox, a justification for why those tools were selected is missing from the report. Data could help illustrate where greatest desired access points are, particularly into neighborhoods, and help justify the recommendations to close off access on some streets. Without data to back it up, they seem somewhat haphazardly placed. It would also be beneficial in determining the best access points to GGNRA. This data could also help prioritize improvements in the areas that have the greatest use and are most critical to improve.

2. It seems like a comprehensive parking demand study is needed for the area. The study presents parking capacity, but does not address demand. Were any parking counts conducted? Any quantitative analysis of current parking use? The study only indicates where parking capacity could be increased, but does not provide any indication whether it meets current demand, or whether it will meet future demand given expected use of the area. This is somewhat critical in determining an overall parking strategy for the Coastside and would really help to inform decisions about size and location of parking facilities.

3. If the goal is to try and encourage alternative modes and reduce the overall vehicle use throughout the corridor, it would be helpful to

indicate the potential reduction in number of motor vehicles that can be expected by providing alternative transportation means. After the presentation, it sounded like the community was focused on enhancing safety and mobility along Highway 1, but did not fully realize that one significant way to do that is by providing the parallel trail and/or the Coastal Trail to get people out of their cars. If the study included a quantitative analysis that indicated x-miles of trail would equate to potentially y-number (or %) of fewer vehicles on the road, it may present a stronger case to develop the non-motorized infrastructure.

4. Transit is not addressed anywhere in the study, which seems like a major component to help increase mobility and reduce vehicle use along the Coastside. With SamTrans Sustainability Plan currently in preparation, it seems like this study should include at least some reference to transit and at least the desire (if not recommendations) to improve service along the Coastside.

5. I assume that sight distance for the proposed crossing locations was evaluated? It seems like some of the proposed locations are tight and questionable. I was not part of the early visioning/outreach sessions, but I assume pedestrian desire lines were discussed? It seems like some of the proposed crossing locations were placed randomly, but it would be helpful to include whatever community feedback was provided in helping to determine the most appropriate crossing locations.

6. The plan discusses the proposed roundabout at Cypress Avenue and a 2008 traffic report that was prepared for the Big Wave Office Park and Wellness Center. That study indicated that the proposed roundabout would operate at capacity if the development were to be built. What is the status of that development? If the roundabout would be at capacity, what are the other alternatives at that intersection? In general, it does not seem like the study considers future growth in the design recommendations.

7. The location of proposed parking within the fallow field is still uncertain. The plan shows a parking lot at the eastern end of the fallow field (per our prior recommendation), although neighbors have expressed concern due to the visual impact. It might be better to show a general location for proposed parking in that area without defining exactly where in the fallow field.

8. The total parking numbers in the presentation were not shown correctly (the graphic showed 20 spaces but the table still indicated 60 spaces).

9. As previously noted, GGNRA does not intend to have a visitor center at the south end of Etheldore.

10. Consideration for access to Rancho via a trailhead south/east of Coral Reef area was not included per previous comments.

11. Note: Caltrans plans for the tunnel now include a full signalized crossing (ped activated and vehicle loop detectors in pavement), not a HAWK signal, at the south tunnel portal. Study should be updated accordingly.

12. We have been keenly interested in evaluating a trailhead on Highway 1 at the northern end of the large field, across from the airport as you approach Moss Beach. It could be smaller in scale than a trailhead north of Montara. We shared this in our previous comments on the draft and hope you can add this to the report. This location merits further study, including sight lines, possible left turn pockets, etc.

13. Typo on cover of study, should read “Walkable” and Livable Communities Institute not “Walkable”.

14. Based on what we heard at the presentation, we would recommend a phased approach for implementation – start with the simple improvements (signage, striping) and monitor over time. Use the more comprehensive tools (roundabouts, overcrossings etc) only if/when necessary.