



Survey: Highway 1 Congestion & Safety Improvement Project

Question: Mirada Road: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

Alternative 1 : 14

Alternative 2 : 12

Question: Explain why you prefer that improvement.

Better safety for pedestrians

Cost and minimize impact on the surrounding area. You are NOT fixing the problem with Sam's Chowder House. Someone is going to get killed there. I cannot believe the restaurant cannot purchase the lot next to them and put in more parking. They must be making enough money.

Do not like either plan

Do not want to widen the road

Doesn't require widening

feels safer

Flashing lights will impede traffic flow.

Raised medians are the safest alternative.

Widening should *not* lead to a future 4-lane highway!

I believe a raised median/safe refuge offset from the actual intersection by a few hundred feet would minimize the number of variables a person would have to check from 4 street flows down to 2. The safe refuge needs to provided adequate protective devices to prevent a vehicle from jumping the median and injuring anyone waiting to cross. I don't think blinking lights, or crossing controls are needed but a street light with down focus illumination on the cross walks would be good.

I do not like either alternative. I prefer two stage crossing with Short raised median . No flashing lights. Low environmental impact

I do not support Alt. 1 or 2. I do not like this survey, due to limited unclear



options available to choose. I would support a lower environmental impact simple two stage refuge island without (false security) controlled signals. Preferably set away from the intersection.

I do not support the alternatives provided.

I like the median between the north and south bound traffic lanes. Features like that - a safe zone in the middle - make me feel safer crossing a busy road.

I see no need for a crossing at Mirada Road. Aside from the fact that it is piecemeal planning, people run red lights. I would not trust a flashing light and a few stripes on the road to consistently stop traffic, especially since people are just getting over their frustration at having been sitting at a standstill where Route 1 merges from 2 lanes to 1, then encountering Frenchman Creek's stoplight. Motorists will then increase their speed, cruising by the time they hit Mirada Road. In addition

I'm not confident that drivers will notice the lights, pedestrians need a refuge.

it is the least disruptive to the flow of traffic. I also feel that all of these improvements are fruitless without some improvement to the gauntlet at surfer beach. That is the biggest traffic snarl culprit and it backs up into neighborhoods both north and south particularly on weekends.

Less is always better. Widening the road for raised medians would require much more construction for a longer period of time. This would create more traffic during construction and the end result is the same amount of lanes.

lower cost, can be implemented sooner

Lower cost, more practical to not add medians, earlier implementation

Lower cost, shorter construction timeline, increased pedestrian/bicycle safety are achieved all without widening the road, increasing the impact on the local environment.

Median and refuge for pedestrians.

Perceive this as the less expensive option; cost of option 2 could best be



spent elsewhere on Hwy 1

SAFETY

Short raised median for a two-stage crossing. Minimal lighting. No flashing lights, no devices to stop traffic.

Simple treatment is adequate in this more rural fringe area where traffic calming is not required.

Some pedestrian protection is better than nothing. Raised medians offer nominally more protection than just painted lines. The more protection the better. This comment applies to all my alternative choices.

The cost of Alternative 2 is very steep. This Alternative allows for no utility relocations or bus stop reconstructions. Although this is a dangerous place to cross improved visibility and pedestrian crossing should notify oncoming vehicles.

The other alternative seems like expensive overkill

There is little benefit of the proposed raised medians in Alternative 2 and a significant cost

This area is constantly congested on nice weekends. Every effort should be put forth to 'calm traffic' through this section.

This area is extremely congested during commute times and heavy tourist weekends. Many cars use the turn lanes to pull out from cross streets and motorists also pass over the double yellow line. A solid raised median would help to prevent accidents and make the area safer for pedestrians and motorists alike.

Visually looks better

Question: Cypress Avenue: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

Alternative 1 : 14

Alternative 2 : 10



Question: Explain why you prefer that improvement.

A roundabout would be the best solution here.

alternative 2 at cypress - Pedestrian crossing needs to take place at Virginia. California has too many feeder roads for any poor soul trying to navigate across the street.

The description of these projects is so confusing to read, that it will be amazing if anyone answers this survey. I have been following these meetings and I am finding the descriptions and diagrams unbearably confusing. This is taking much more time than I have available to complete this.

Better fits the needs of that intersection, also can be implemented sooner

Better safety for pedestrians

constructing a raised median has a negative environmental impact and is unnecessary. Additional lighted signage will accomplish the same thing

Conversion of southbound left-turn lane to northbound left-merge lane by simple restriping should be done ASAP and independently of other improvements. Alt 2 raised medians define village entry, provide traffic calming, and offer safer 2-stage highway crossing without need for crosswalk at this location.

Dangerous area with two-way traffic; median would serve to reduce accidents and separate traffic lanes.

do not like either plan

feels safer

For essentially the same reasons as the Mirada Road crossing.

I am pleased with the acceleration lane in both alternatives. This will make etheldore street more active after construction as residents from Montara (sunshine valley) and Moss beach will use Etheldore to Cypress or Etheldore to go Northbound hwy 1. I like Alternative 1 because it does not require relocation utilities and is much less expensive.



I do not support Alt. 1 or 2. I do not like this survey, due to limited unclear options available to choose. I would support an acceleration lane northbound 1 from Cypress.

I do not support the alternatives provided.

I don't like either alternative 1 or 2 and don't see them alleviating the current backup of east bound traffic on Cypress Ave because of traffic turning left (northbound Hwy 1). Future development may necessitate a roundabout with a safe crossing would be better but this alternative is not even given. No traffic lights, they only cause more congestion.

I don't notice a whole lot of pedestrian activity in that area.

I like the idea of consolidating crossings

I like the median between the north and south bound traffic lanes. Features like that - a safe zone in the middle - make me feel safer crossing a busy road.

I think the middle lane on Hwy 1 through this section is sufficient and raised medians in this section would add more confusion than help pedestrians.

I want roundabouts to slow people down through the midcoast!

I want short raised median or refuge island. , no controlled lights , lowest environmental impact,

It's the lesser of two evils. No crossing here would be better, but unrealistic.

Lower cost, more practical to not add medians, earlier implementation

Lower cost, shorter construction timeline, increased pedestrian/bicycle safety are achieved all without widening the road, increasing the impact on the local environment.

Median and refuge for pedestrians.

Much lower cost.

No raised medians equals less environmental impact, more affordability and



less delays during construction. Again, the amount of traffic lanes remains the same therefore not accomplishing exponential differences either way. Lower the speed limit throughout Coastside and enforce them. Smooth traffic delivers results.

Pedestrian crossing not necessary here

Safer, more work put in

SAFETY

Section 3.1 of the draft study stipulates that the purpose of this project is for increased ped safety and traffic congestion alleviation. With the designs proposed, these two purposes are at odds with each other. More at-grade ped crossings on a busy highway will absolutely increase traffic congestions. These alternatives will not make things any better. In addition to increased traffic congestion, these crossings will encourage more crossing of the highway. Continued below:

The traffic calming measures, signage and acceleration lane provide the most cost effective measures.

Question: Moss Beach: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

Alternative 1A : 8

Alternative 1B : 5

Alternative 2 : 11

Question: Explain why you prefer that improvement.

Alternative 2 is expensive and requires widening the road and relocating utilities. It says that it will help with broadside accidents. I chose Alternative 1B to increase visibility and have one pedestrian crossing instead of two pedestrian crossings right next to each other.

As above, in my opinion, the less distractions for drivers through this section the better for peds. The continual presence of SMC Sheriff's vehicles at the substation would be a cost effective way to 'calm traffic' in this section too.



At California convert (repaint) southbound left-turn lane to northbound left-merge lane from west side. At Vermont convert (repaint) northbound left-turn lane to southbound left-merge lane from east side. At Cypress, conversion of southbound left-turn lane to northbound left-merge lane by simple restriping should be done ASAP and independently of other improvements.

Blocking off Virginia and forcing this left turn (north bound) traffic to the already horrendous Fitzgerald traffic on California is not the answer. I also think pedestrian crossings at both intersections will contribute to the traffic problem. Pick one. Disrupting local wetlands is not acceptable. Without creating additional traffic lanes the traffic increases we are seeing will not be alleviated. Again, lower the speeds, enforce this option and control the flow.

Cost.

Dangerous area with two-way traffic; median would serve to reduce accidents and separate traffic lanes.

do not any of the plans

Do not want to widen the road

Drivers think it is a highway, since it no longer is--make it obvious.

Feels more inviting to walk from one side to the other and visually it improves the look of the neighborhood.

feels safer

I do not support Alt. 1a,b or 2. I do not like this survey, due to limited unclear options available to choose. I would support a lower environmental impact simple two stage refuge island without (false security) controlled signals. Preferably set at Virginia s/b left turn pocket.

I do not support the alternatives provided.

I don't like any of the alternatives 1a, 1b, or 2. I think one raised median/safe refuge placed between the Virginia & California intersection would minimize the number of variables a person would have to check from 4 street flows down to 2 when crossing. I don't think blinking lights, or crossing controls



are needed but a street light with down focus illumination on the cross walks would be good. A roundabout at Valemar/Etheldore (North) on Hwy 1 might be viable and serve as a traffic calming d

I like the idea of consolidating crossings

I like the median between the north and south bound traffic lanes. Features like that - a safe zone in the middle - make me feel safer crossing a busy road.

I like this alternative best but feel that two independent ped xings are overkill. Flashing signage indicating the crossing is more than exists now and is the most cost effective solution. I am completely opposed to restricting traffic at Virginia. It will add additional traffic to Cal.Ave which already has a heavy burden of traffic with the marine sanctuary. This would also add confusion to an already unusual traffic configuration at Wienke Way thus would also propose the ped xing at Virginia

I think it best fits the needs and traffic patterns, as well as being able to be completed sooner. I'd like the central medina in alternative 2, but the timing seems to far out. I also believe the 1B pedestrian crossing should be moved from California to Virginia, because I see significantly more pedestrians and bicycles at Virginia, compared to California.

I want roundabouts to slow people down through the midcoast!

I want short raised median or refuge island. , no controlled lights , lowest environmental impact,

Lower cost, shorter construction timeline, increased pedestrian/bicycle safety are achieved all without widening the road, increasing the impact on the local environment.

Many people live on the east side of Hwy 1 and struggle, especially on weekends, to get across to the recreation areas. I think this provides the best safety for pedestrians, including people walking with children, strollers and/or pets.

Median and refuge for pedestrians.

More crossings mean higher probability of accidents. Simple statistics.



"Traffic calming" means slower traffic and more congestion. From page 36 of the draft study: "Both alternatives are anticipated to slow traffic within the project area." Have any traffic simulations models/counts been run to determine what roadway and intersection LOS will be after the installation of these crossings?

No disturbance of wetlands

None of those proposals are any good. Put in a mid-block short raised median for a two-stage crossing. Minimal lighting. No flashing lights, no devices to stop traffic.

Raised medians define the entry points, provide traffic calming and opportunity for 2-stage highway crossing for the length of town. One crosswalk with RRFB at Virginia is sufficient, preferably on north side, deleting left-turn lane at that location to allow pedestrian refuge. Additionally, re-stripe center lane to southbound left merge at Vermont and northbound left merge at California. These modifications would also apply to Alt 1, if chosen.

Right turn in and out only on Virginia is not a good idea given the location of the small market which generates customers from both directions and both sides of the highway. Turning movements to and from Highway 1 and to and from the frontage road at California and Vermont are not desirable movements given proximity of frontage road to Highway 1 and given increased queuing on Vermont and California due to elimination of left turns at Virginia.

SAFETY

The single RRFB crossing is enough, the improvement in left turns

This alternative seems the safest one.

Question: 16th Street, Montara: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

Alternative 1 : 15

Alternative 2 : 9

Question: Explain why you prefer that improvement.



Alternative 2 is lesser of evils, but still too much as proposed. Put in a short raised median away from the cross streets for a two-stage crossing. Minimal lighting. No flashing lights, no devices to stop traffic.

Better safety for pedestrians

Cost. You won't get a 10x better solution with Alt. 2, which costs 10x. Also, you are not fixing the real problem which is southbound traffic turning left on 14th. We have lived at 175 Farallone for 25 years (just north of 14th) and hear the accidents! The problem is not so much speed as it is inattentive drivers not expecting a car to be stopped in front of them.

Dangerous area with two-way traffic; median would serve to reduce accidents and separate traffic lanes.

Do not install flashing beacons with this alternative.

Do not like either plan

Feels more inviting to walk from one side to the other and visually it improves the look of the neighborhood.

feels safer

Formalize connection of 16th St to Carlos for Hwy 1 access, which allows closing 16th St. access to Hwy 1, which would allow conversion of southbound left turn at 16th to northbound left merge lane from lighthouse/MWSD.

I do not support Alt. 1 or 2. I do not like this survey, due to limited unclear options available to choose. I would support a lower environmental impact simple two stage refuge island without (false security) controlled signals. Preferably set away from the intersection.

I do not support the alternatives provided.

I don't like either alternative 1 or 2. Hwy 1, Carlos St., 16 St., and the Light House intersection were completely messed up by CalTrans when they did the repaving and striping. A raised median/safe refuge at 16th St would be good but an over crossing south of Carlos St. would be safer. You can NOT



eliminate the informal trail east of Highway 1 between 16th and 14th Sts., as it is used by many people walking between Moss Beach and Montara.

I don't see many pedestrians in this area.

I like the median between the north and south bound traffic lanes. Features like that - a safe zone in the middle - make me feel safer crossing a busy road.

I want roundabouts to slow people down through the midcoast!

Informal trail along east side of Hwy 1 is important and should not be eliminated. It should be improved and pedestrian safety measures should be added (San Carlos to 16th Street). This is the only pedestrian access between Moss Beach and Montara.

Less cost. Not much less relief. Do not use expensive and time consuming measures for minimal improvement. Without more lanes what are we accomplishing? Safty is a seperate issue and could be considered on it's own agenda.

Like the flashing light beacons

Lower cost, more practical to not add median, earlier implementation, no need for widening.

Lower cost, shorter construction timeline, increased pedestrian/bicycle safety are achieved all without widening the road, increasing the impact on the local environment.

Median and refuge for pedestrians.

No loss of trail

Perceive this as the less expensive option; cost of option 2 could best be spent elsewhere on Hwy 1

SAFETY

short raised median. No controlled traffic lights . lowest environmental impact



since this is on a curve and slope, and has significant pedestrian traffic due to the hostel and informal coastal trail, I think a median here is desirable, but the widening required, and impact on the existing informal trail would be too significant.

The poor visibility makes this location a bad choice for a crossing. Again probably not feasible to eliminate the crossing--do what you can to make it noticable.

This is another dangerous intersection. I chose alternative 1 because it will bring more visibility and a crosswalk to and from the lighthouse. Alternative 2 is too expensive and requires a retaining wall.

to keep the traffic moving but alert infrequent travelers of the presence of pedestrians

Would be much more helpful to people if the lengthy descriptions of the design alternatives were accompanied with the design drawings. Having the drawings in separate attachments makes it hard for people to visualize while they read and hard to understand the complicated drawings and project details while they visualize.

Question: Montara: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

Alternative 1 : 11

Alternative 2 : 12

Question: Explain why you prefer that improvement.

Again, it is no longer, functionally, a highway--do what you can to make the point to drivers.

Beach access at 2nd necessitates ped safety improvements. Raised medians important given vehicular volumes and number of informal turning movements to restaurant, beach parking and 2nd Avenue. Possibly signalize?

Better safety for pedestrians



Cost and less concrete. Also, a general suggestion: Make the entire stretch from Devil's Slide to HMB 45 mph, except past the airport, which can stay 55. With the speed limit toggling back and forth between 45 and 50, it encourages people to speed.

Dangerous area with two-way traffic; median would serve to reduce accidents and separate traffic lanes.

do not either plan

Do not want to widen the road

Feels more inviting to walk from one side to the other and visually it improves the look of the neighborhood.

feels safer

For both 2nd and 7th street pedestrian crossings and increase visibility will help motorists to slow down in downtown Montara. It is much needed to beach access and not sure where 7th street will take you on the west side of highway. Would you be able to turn left on 7th street and 2nd street heading to northbound? Currently 7th street does not allow left turns but cars do it anyway

I do not support Alt. 1 or 2. I do not like this survey, due to limited unclear options available to choose. I would support a lower environmental impact simple two stage refuge island without (false security) controlled signals. Preferably set away from the intersection.

I do not support the alternatives provided.

I don't like either alternative 1 or 2. I am in favor of raised median/safe refuge crossing at 2nd and 7th. I don't think blinking lights, or crossing controls are needed but a street light with down focus illumination on the crosswalks would be good for dusk to dawn crossings. The left turn lanes and other turning directions are not explained well and were never fully presented to give the community a chance to see how traffic patterns would be changed in both Moss Beach and Montara.

I like the idea of consolidating crossings



I like the median between the north and south bound traffic lanes. Features like that - a safe zone in the middle - make me feel safer crossing a busy road.

I want roundabouts to slow people down through the midcoast!

Less work

Lower cost, more practical to not widen the road, safety improvement achieved with this option is sufficient

Lower cost, shorter construction timeline, increased pedestrian/bicycle safety are achieved all without widening the road, increasing the impact on the local environment.

Median and refuge for pedestrians.

Neither choice is any good. Long (continuous) raised medians are not needed and are inappropriate for the character of the Midcoast. Put in a mid-block short raised median for a two-stage crossing. Minimal lighting. No flashing lights, no devices to stop traffic.

No controlled signals nor lights. Short raised medians/refuge island

Please do not install flashing beacons here too.

SAFETY

same as above; in addition I truly believe that if a single speed limit was chosen for this corridor it would also help the traffic flow. From the tunnel to half moon there are 5 speed limits: 45 to 50 to 55 to 50 to 45 to 40.

Same reasons... too much finances with delays and lacking accomplishments.

The only things that are going to make crossing the highway safer is above-grade or below-grade crossings, especially at Gray Whale Cove, 16th street, and Miramar. The only things that are going to alleviate traffic congestion instead of greatly contributing to it are above-grade or below-grade crossings, especially at Gray Whale Cove, 16th street, and Miramar. All else is just a band-aid on a compound fracture, somewhat of a waste of money



and time, and a false sense of having done something.

This area is dangerous for merging drivers and pedestrians. Any efforts to slow traffic and improve pedestrian safety is helpful.

This is the minimal effort, and could be in place sooner. I'd prefer elements of alternative two, perhaps reducing or eliminating west-bound left turn lanes to accommodate a raised median, without roadway widening. For example, there are only 4 houses on 7th, west of Hwy 1. A left turn lane doesn't really seem necessary there (I lived a block from this intersection for 3 years, and crossed at 7th frequently to get to the bluff and reef). 2nd street really does need the median do to use level

Undecided -- While road widening necessitating retaining walls is a concern, this does provide the additional significant benefit of widened shoulders where bike lanes are currently substandard.

Question: Gray Whale Cove: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

Alternative 1 : 15

Alternative 2 : 11

Question: Explain why you prefer that improvement.

Actually either works and neither will help the traffic issues. Safty and traffic cannot be looked at in the same fashion.

alternative 1 - but no flashing lights. Caltrans was able to change many of their routine standards when it came to the tunnel. They can do the same for the crossings here.

Dangerous area with two-way traffic; median would serve to reduce accidents and separate traffic lanes.

do not either plan

Do not want to widen the road

Don't really care on this one. Costs are very close. Another general note: the behavior of pedestrians needs to be enforced, not just vehicles. Otherwise,



you will put in a crosswalk and still have the dang peds running across the road wherever they damn feel like it. We were coming home from the City one night at 11:00 when 3 people darted in front of us in the pure dark. Only God's grace saved us all.

feels safer

I do not support Alt. 1 or 2. I do not like this survey, due to limited unclear options available to choose. I would support a lower environmental impact simple two stage refuge island without (false security) controlled signals. Preferably set away from the intersection.

I do not support the alternatives provided.

I do not think stopping traffic on hwy 1 is required at grey whale cove. Rather alternative one widens the road, adds an acceleration lane northbound, and improves visibility.

I don't like either alternative 1 or 2. While I am in favor of left turn lanes into and out of the parking lot, I am not in favor of flashing beacons or other kind of control lighting. Simple pedestrian crossing signs are enough. In fact, since the beach closes at sunset even street lighting should be avoided. As far as the placement of the crosswalk, I think an at-grade crossing is dangerous at the location and it should be further south. It should have a raised median/safe refuge for tourists

I don't really like either option at this location. Why not a tunnel or a bridge? We just build a much bigger tunnel as I recall. And why aren't we done with the Green Valley Trail?

I'm not a traffic expert, but this curve has to rank up there on dangers for pedestrians. Anything to warn drivers ahead of this blind curve of people crossing would be an improvement.

Improves pedestrian safety without compromising on environmental impact

Minimize the flashing lights for Alternative 1. Alternative 2 is unacceptable due to stopping traffic, which will cause many rear-end collisions and greatly increase traffic congestion.

No hybrid beacon.



No overhead lights! They would be visible from much of Montara at night, and the existing tunnel flashing yellow is already disturbing. View is too important, overhead lights are not necessary for safe crossing.

Non residents aren't expecting pedestrians, they're looking at the view...

Overhead signage seems a bit "too much" for this rural location.

Prefer RRFB which are less obtrusive.

RRFB crossing is less disruptive to vehicle traffic, since there are no auto-pedestrian accidents in table 2-3, the more disruptive option (which is also higher cost) is not warranted.

SAFETY

short raised median or refuge island. No controlled traffic light signal . Lowest environmental impact.

That area is an accident waiting to happen and Alternative 1 seems the safest alternative.

the left turn lane will keep traffic moving south bound and the flashing beacons will remind cars that there are peds xing.

There are so many pedestrians at this location the higher level of driver compliance is a good idea.

This crossing needs the signal as proposed; I have nearly been rear-ended several times slowing for pedestrians here.

This is a very dangerous intersection. I think there will be fatalities if we don't address the problem of the parking lot on the east side and a beautiful beach across the street.

This is not a residential area or a huge walking area. This area just needs a basic crosswalk for when folks need to cross. Crossing is only an issue on the weekends. A simple cross walk is fine - no lights.

This opportunity for input is extremely disappointing. Nowhere is there any



place to make larger comments about the project as a whole or to ask questions. We are basically given two extremely similar options for each location and then asked to pick which one of the two very similar options we prefer. What if we prefer neither and have other suggestions? Like above-grade and below-grade crossings. Limit of 500 characters per comment? Please . . .

We are in a very different and critical space at this time, namely the most severe drought ever seen in CA, even though it's only 3 years. We had a 6 year drought and it wasn't as severe because there was half the population then. This could become the norm.

We should not consider widening hwy 1 nor urban type infrastructure to accommodate ever more growth. Short, narrow median strips periodically is all we need for safe crossing & low lighting if necessary.

Comments

Number of Comments 10

Comment 1: Public comments from meetings last June and July on this topic are carefully captured and posted on MCC Hwy 1 issues page:

<http://www.midcoastcommunitycouncil.org/highway-1/>

They are worth reviewing for content and the contrast with this online survey process and the March 11 meeting format. | By Lisa K

Comment 2: I have witnessed the Gray Whale Cove Parking Lot become a significant choke point for SR 1. I have seen traffic backed up for miles as a result on peak weekend use. To mitigate, I recommend somehow controlling left turns into and out of the parking lot at peak use. I feel it is reasonable to have no left turns out of the parking lot. There is now a safe place to make a u-turn at the south portal signal of the tunnel. An under grade crossing (similar to Julia Pfeiffer State Beach) would also be a great benefit to Gray Whale Cove safe access and reduce SR 1 congestion. | By Dan H

Comment 3: I am concerned that widespread objections by the community to the proposed changes to State Route 1 in the Midcoast have not been adequately addressed in the limited choices presented for voting in the online survey. Protecting the existing beauty of State Route 1 appears to be a common thread in previous community comments. Specifically, a frequent request is to have the lowest possible impact on environment and congestion while providing appropriate safe crossings. It appears that a "two-stage" pedestrian refuge island concept without flashing beacons could provide better pedestrian and vehicle safety, with a lower impact to overall traffic flow on SR 1. Some areas may require flashing beacons. This should



be explored as to limit the effect of a false sense of security. A two-stage pedestrian crossing allows the pedestrian to cross half way, only having to check traffic in one direction at a time. I have currently witnessed locals using turn pockets as two stage crossings.

I By Dan H

Comment 4: I don't think blinking lights, or crossing controls are needed but a street light with down focus illumination on the cross walks would be good for dusk to dawn crossings.

Minimize any widening to increase traffic calming effects.

Hwy 1 needs painted bike lanes from the tunnel south to HMB.

A maximum speed limit of 45 mph should be consistent through out the Midcoast except maybe at the airport.

Surfers Beach needs to be addressed. Originally it was in the study but was taken out because it was too hard to fix and yet on a sunny weekend it is the biggest congestion point in the Midcoast.

Proposed medians and turns in Moss Beach and Montara are confusing. Too many parts an options to understand the overall affects. The plans need to be presented in smaller chunks with all the variables listed so each community can see what their own situation will be. Traffic flows are not fully fleshed out and will cause many future problems if not supported by the residents.

I By Bill K

Comment 5: The survey should include one of the three options below:

- 1.) none of the above
- 2.) against all alternatives provided
- 3.) I do not support the alternatives provided I By Sabrina B

Comment 6: Note the survey has been adjusted so that comments can be made on each location without choosing an alternative. If you already submitted your survey, you may click Change Your Survey to start over. I By Lisa K

Comment 7: I submitted my survey response and got this message, "Whoops! A required question has no answer".

I'm including my comments here because the survey is significantly flawed. The survey prevents the public from making alternative suggestions without rewriting the survey:



Mirada Road: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

I support a roundabout with a crosswalk at Mirada Rd. I do NOT support Alternative 1 or 2.

Cypress Avenue: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

I support a roundabout with a crosswalk OR a traffic signal with a crosswalk at Cypress. I do NOT support Alternative 1 or 2.

Moss Beach: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

I support a roundabout with a crosswalk OR a traffic signal with a crosswalk. I do NOT support Alternative 1A, 1B or 2.

16th Street, Montara: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

I support an over crossing NEAR 16th and Carlos St. I do NOT support Alternative 1 or 2.

Gray Whale Cove: What alternative outlined in the report do you prefer?

I support an over crossing at Gray Whale Cove. I do NOT support Alternative 1 or 2.

PLEASE NOTE: A striped bike lane should be included on Highway 1.

I By Sabrina B

Comment 8: MONTARA: In weighing alternatives, consider the Pacific Coast Bicycle Route that Caltrans is supposed to maintain. Pavement widening to accommodate the center raised median of Alt 2 will also improve the shoulder width from 2 ft in places to 6-8 ft. I By Lisa K

Comment 9: MOSS BEACH: Don't restrict highway access without providing improved access close by. Conversion of two left-turn lanes to left-merge lanes can provide improved highway access points for both sides of the highway, as low-cost near-term improvement. At California convert (repaint) southbound left-turn lane to northbound left-merge lane from west side. At Vermont convert (repaint) northbound left-turn lane to southbound left-merge lane from east side. At Cypress, conversion of southbound left-turn lane to northbound left-merge lane by simple restriping should be done ASAP and independently of other improvements.

LIGHTHOUSE/16th: Formalize the connection of 16th St to Carlos for Hwy 1 access and close 16th St access to Hwy 1. Convert (repaint) southbound left-turn lane at 16th to northbound left-merge lane from lighthouse/MWSD, which has significantly higher vehicle counts. I By Lisa K

Comment 10: 1.) KEEP STRIPING, FORGET ABOUT ALL RAISED MEDIANS!

2.)ADD OR ADJUST ACCELERATION LANES ONTO THE HIGHWAY AS WELL AS THE TURN OFFS.

3.) COUNTY TO WORK WITH CALTRANS TO IMPROVE WEST CYPRESS INTERSECTION FOR A SOUTHBOUND TURNING STRIP ONTO CYPRESS FROM THE HIGHWAY, AS



WELL AS A WIDENING OF THE "MOUTH" OF CYPRESS TO ALLOW MOTORISTS TO TURN RIGHT WHEN A LEFT TURNING CAR AT THE FRONT OF THE LINE-UP IS HOLDING UP EVERYONE INCLUDING SOUTHBOUND FOLKS, WHILE WAITING FOR A BREAK IN TRAFFIC TO TURN LEFT. ALLOWING THE RIGHT TURNERS TO GET BY WOULD HELP CLEAR THE BACK UP, BUT AT PRESENT THERE IS A DEEP (SLIGHTLY BROKEN) CULVERT THERE WHICH PREVENTS THAT POSSIBILITY. | By Cid Y