

# Midcoast Community Council

An elected Municipal Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors

P.O. Box 248, Moss Beach, CA 94038      www.MidcoastCommunityCouncil.org

Dave Olson . Chris Johnson . Lisa Ketcham . Dan Haggerty . Erin Deinzer . Laura Stein . vacancy

## Approved Minutes: Special Meeting on April 28, 2015, at GCSD

**Call to Order.** 7:02 PM

All councilmembers present

9 members of the public

### 1. Board of Supervisors' Report – Nicholas Calderón

**7<sup>th</sup> St Fence Encroachment Permit:** At today's Board of Supervisor's appeal hearing Supervisor Horsley requested to continue the item in order to have staff pursue a specific compromise solution suggested by Lisa Ketcham on Monday.

**Public Outdoor WiFi:** Pilot project was done in Pescadero, and now planned for North Fair Oaks location, Fitzgerald Marine Reserve, and Pillar Ridge community center, funded by County Measure A sale tax. In County Parks it enables Interactive Ranger for students.

**LED Streetlights:** County seeks public feedback on pilot LED fixtures to be installed at the 3 Midcoast post offices. SMCSpeakout.com will have survey formatted for open-ended comments. 3 out of 6 pilot fixtures have been installed to date, but not turned on yet. Notification of sample installation and survey will be post on Nextdoor, post offices, affected light poles.

### 2. Public Comment/ Announcements

Bill Kehoe: County should video future meetings of Connect the Coastside; provide data behind report and accident data at California Ave.

Dan Haggerty: Fire District special meeting 4/29 at El Granada fire station on new fire station

### 3. Consent Agenda: approved 6-0.

a. Approve Minutes for April 8, 2015

### 4. Regular Agenda

a. (7:15) **Design Alternatives for Midcoast At-Grade Crossings, Raised Medians and Left Turns.** Desired outcome: Approve comments on the Feb 23, 2015 draft Preliminary Planning Study for the Hwy 1 Congestion & Safety Improvement Project.

Lisa presented the draft letter.

Terminology to avoid misunderstanding:

- Streetlights vs traffic control devices: For traffic control devices, say signals or beacons (flashing beacons, traffic signals). Use the words lights or lighting to refer to night lighting and streetlights only -- illuminating the darkness.
- Road widening: Consider context. Clarify what for, such as adding turn lane for safety/congestion relief, or adding raised median for traffic calming/safety/crossing refuge. These are very different from adding travel lanes to increase road capacity. Highway travel & center turn lanes are 12 ft wide. Raised median pedestrian refuges are minimum 6 ft wide plus 2 ft shoulders on each side = 10 ft total -- fits in a left turn lane without road widening. Adding raised medians while retaining left turn lanes, need to add 10 ft of road width, or 5 ft on each side. Shoulder width is 8 ft minimum but exceptions are widespread.

Erin: Last Sunday Dream Machines traffic was using Main St and Sunshine Valley Rd to 2<sup>nd</sup> St Montara to get around northbound Hwy 1 afternoon backup. Vehicles backed up on highway wouldn't let others turn into and out of 2<sup>nd</sup> St.

Dan: Prefers prohibiting left turns at Gray Whale Cove due to congestion.

Bill Kehoe: agrees with letter 90% and fully supports raised medians. Wants more study of Moss Beach circulation. Lots of southbound Montara traffic via Sunshine Valley Rd enters the highway at Vermont. Miramar should have a crossing, even if not at Mirada Rd. If connecting Carlos to 16<sup>th</sup>, it would improve vehicle safety to divert all traffic to 16<sup>th</sup> St.

--Dave: Land between Carlos and 16<sup>th</sup> is private property which complicates connecting those roads.

Leonard Woren: Great job on the letter. Moss Beach has too many access points. Left turns off highway should not be allowed without left turn lane.

Carl May: Moss Beach doesn't have highway access backups like El Granada because of the availability of alternative access. Proposed raised medians are extended too far. Project should focus on safe crossings.

Len Erickson: Steering Committee is needed to digest project complexity. Council should prioritize certain locations to move forward to completion expeditiously such as Gray Whale Cove and Montara 2<sup>nd</sup> St, with others such as Moss Beach needing further study.

Nicholas: Letters from MCC are always extremely helpful, especially in the level of detail provided.

Acceleration lanes were added to the project because they are in the spirit of the project scope. If a specific project is not implementable, the consultants are to develop a project that meets that spirit but is implementable. Caltrans did not review and comment on the Mobility Studies to the degree they should have – many of the concept plans do not comply with Caltrans regulations.

It was clear after seeing online survey comments and at the April 15 Connect the Coastside workshop that we are not ready to close out on a preferred alternative. We will have one more workshop, at MCC June 10 meeting or thereabouts, to present revised designs, with report released for review at least 2 weeks in advance. We will improve the summary so that each location with alternatives is easy to compare on the same page, and give people another opportunity to provide comments. We will make sure consultants see MCC written comments. We will revise Moss Beach and Montara with scaled-back raised medians.

What we heard was, the community wants pedestrian refuges for safety, and raised medians for traffic calming, and doesn't want flashing beacons. The community is concerned about light pollution and therefore wants streetlights that are appropriate for the setting. We will do our best to meet those objectives, while emphasizing that we have to meet Caltrans standards. We need to balance what will meet the needs of the community with what we can actually implement. We need to present the differences in the alternatives in a way that is easy to visualize and easy to digest.

The preferred alternative will be determined from feedback from the next workshop and comment period. If there are common themes in comments, the consultants will make any necessary adjustments, then send document to Caltrans for full internal review. After that comes environmental and design phase.

If the quickest cheapest alternative is selected and implemented at any one location, that is the end of the project as far as this funding source is concerned. That does not mean that changes or a more comprehensive project could not be done in the future with other funding sources if secured.

Laura: is happy with the letter, but what do councilmembers think about breakout sessions which several people asked for, such as on Moss Beach.

Chris: Community comments go to consultants, which seems to be a black box, and they come back with something, and we comment again which goes into the black box, etc. Same 10 or 15 people comment every time. What is the value in having breakout

meetings, of having the same discussion with the same small group of people, unless somebody has some new ideas on getting new people to participate? Not sure how village-specific breakout meetings will move the ball forward. Would like more community input but not seeing it, on any issue.

Lisa: Open to focused discussions before next workshop which could help understanding and refine ideas, but we need to approve this letter tonight.

Dave: OK with scheduling breakout sessions IF we can get more people to come – doesn't think consultants need to be present.

Nicholas: would be willing to attend.

Chris: Would like to see something different in the presentation of designs, to show in real time what suggested modifications would look like, rather than wait months between meetings and design changes. Design revisions never seem to come back as what we thought we had said. Too many details, too complex – could be a reason why people tune out.

Laura moved approve letter as written. Dan second.

Dave moved to amend the letter, to prioritize the projects that can get done in the relatively short term, that in this next revision the consultants should spend the effort on things that are likely to be implemented. Don't fine tune the high-end option.

Laura seconded Dave's motion to amend.

Lisa: Once we have a preferred alternative, then we can prioritize locations.

Chris: The letter is strong enough as is and we will have another chance to talk about prioritizing projects.

Dave withdrew his amendment.

Motion to approve letter as written, passed 5-0 (Erin left the meeting at 8:50pm prior to vote.)

**b. (9:15) Connect the Coastside, a project to develop a Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan (CTMP)**

Lisa: The CTMP is a requirement of the LCP specifically to address cumulative traffic impacts of Midcoast residential development on Highway 1 & 92. Based on an analysis of traffic impacts at buildout, specific policies will be developed to offset the demand for all peak period vehicle trips generated by new residential development. The plan will evaluate expanded public transit, bike/ped facilities, and programs for traffic mitigation fees on new development, and mandatory lot merger and lot retirement.

CTMP is a Plan with policies, not a project to be built (as the 5 crossing project). Asked Nicholas for update from County since April 15 Connect the Coastside public meeting.

Nicholas: County objective is to mitigate traffic impacts from existing and future development, not just with policies but also with projects. At the last public workshop on April 15, the disconnect was abundantly clear between Connect the Coastside and what the community desires. Supervisor Horsley has requested 3 additional workshops. We are making revisions to the transportation "hybrid alternative" based on community feedback. We are also looking at the Buildout Analysis which received substantial criticism at the last workshop. Consultants originally looked at full potential buildout based on existing developable lots. We are now looking at what is a more appropriate way to conduct a buildout analysis in light of community feedback. We will revise and come back with a different plan in line with what the community would like and what the Coastal Commission is expecting.

Dave: Policy section should be separate from projects.

Chris: Project vs policy – the County has created a problem for itself by trying to conflate policy and specific design plans until people don't know what it is – they think it's the safe crossings. I don't see how the public can have any idea what this thing is.

Nicholas: We need to provide better educational opportunities for the community. When people say policies, they're thinking land use policies. There is a section in the Buildout

Analysis for water and sewer -- will revisit those and make sure they are accurate. The section on land use alternatives is still being drafted. We'd like to have two workshops strictly on land use policies, which will be incorporated into the final document.

Lisa: Lack of advance documents at the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) severely hinders members' ability to participate effectively in TAC meetings. Perhaps there are some TAC members whose comments are absorbed in subsequent drafts, but comments from MCC rep and alternate seem to be ignored (unlike our experience with Plan Princeton which has both a TAC and Steering Committee). Hopefully results can be improved both for the TAC and the public.

Nicholas: Lisa is 100% right – reports have been released far too late for adequate TAC review. The last TAC meeting was canceled because we felt the land use document wasn't ready. County has now set a two-week deadline for the consultants to release documents before TAC and community meetings. We are making an effort to slow the process down so we can adequately receive feedback.

Laura: There is good composition of members on the TAC – is there some way to make the meetings more interactive?

Nicholas: First big step to spark the dialog is making sure they get the documents.

Len Erickson: LCP CTMP envisioned that future transportation demand might be greater than transportation systems could provide. Connect the Coastside seems to propose there's no reason we shouldn't meet any transportation demand that comes along.

Leonard Woren: Limit buildout to no more than 1980 LCP. Limit house size over all residential lots.

Fran Pollard: Severe drought could become the norm. We must downsize. Don't allow building on substandard lots.

Carl May: Traffic is directly related to population and thus to water and the severe drought. There is a mechanism for lowering buildout -- LCP is changeable.

## **5. Council Activity – Correspondence received & meetings attended –**

Lisa: New RV Park proposed on 3-acre vacant parcel at corner of Hwy 1 & Capistrano next to Harbor Village parking lot, to include 50-space RV park with 7 tent camping spaces, 25 vehicle parking spaces, & single-story laundry/restroom. Pre-application workshop for public & agency comment will be scheduled in the near future. Note that the CCC encourages affordable coastal visitor lodging.

Dave attended GCSD meeting on parks survey results, to be posted on GCSD website soon.

## **6. Future Agendas**

May 13 – Community Choice Aggregation presentation; Princeton parking

May 27 -

June 10 – Crossings workshop

## **Adjourn – 10:03 PM**