



1970 Broadway, Suite 740
Oakland, CA 94612
510.763.2061
www.dksassociates.com

MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 3, 2014

TO: James Hinkamp, San Mateo County,
CTMP TAC

FROM: Bill Loudon, DKS Associates

SUBJECT: San Mateo County CTMP TAC Meeting Minutes 9-30-14

P#14012-000

The DKS Team provided an introduction to the San Mateo County CTMP project – Connect the Coastside - and a summary of the results from Task 2: Existing Conditions, Buildout Analysis, Traffic Projections and Deficiency Analysis. In response to the presentation, the following comments were received, and DKS Team responses given, during the San Mateo County CTMP TAC meeting on September 30, 2014:

1. There are different sidewalk design guidelines and standards in different jurisdictions and in different neighborhoods of the unincorporated County. These differences in the design guidelines and standards reflect differences in the character of the neighborhoods. It is not the standard that all neighborhoods have sidewalks or that sidewalks all have to be a particular width. Joe Lo Coco can get the team the design guidelines and standards for the County.
 - o Response – The team will get the relevant information about the differences in standards and use this information in the evaluation of need for improvements.
2. Parking availability and use should reflect special arrangements that have been made with private land owners for use of their parking. The La Costanera Restaurant, for instance, is required to make their parking available for beach and trail access until 5:00 PM each day. Arrangements such as this should be reflected in our inventory and analysis of parking use and availability.
 - o Response – The team will get the relevant information about parking arrangements such as this and use this information in the evaluation of the need for improvements.
3. The presentation indicated that there is no charge or time restriction for most of the parking with the exception of downtown Half Moon Bay. Several of the beaches have charges for parking and this should be reflected in our report and any future presentations.
 - o Response – The team will get the relevant information about parking charges and use this information in the evaluation of the need for improvements.
4. Does the travel forecast with the Buildout (2040) include forecasts for visitation to the local, state and NPS beaches and trails? NPS has developed forecasts for its on-going analysis of parking and access for the Midcoast sites and is happy to share their forecasts.
 - o Response – The team has made some effort to forecast weekend and recreational travel, but the forecast information from NPS would be very useful.



5. Does the travel forecast with the Buildout (2040) include forecasts for increased activity to the Harbor? The Harbor District is very interested in seeing how its access is impacted by growth. Plan Princeton does not include the Harbor, so they are interested in having an analysis of their future access needs.
 - Response – The forecasting presented in the Task 2 draft report includes the effect of added buildout development within and around the Harbor, but the team will also talk with the Harbor District to see if additional information about planned Harbor District activity might result in more useful forecasts for the area.
6. The project should look at the current plans for multi-use trails and where the gaps are.
 - Response – The team will definitely be reviewing the current plans for the multi-use trails.
7. The California Coastal Trail Act calls for a continuous coastal trail the length of California from border to border. This may have implications for Connect the Coastside.
 - Response – The team will review the California Coastal Trail Act and assess its implications for Connect the Coastside.
8. Do current limitations on water availability limit the Buildout forecast?
 - Response – The Buildout was not bounded by current water limitations. It was assumed that the supply might increase over time.
9. Was the use of individual water wells by private property owners recognized and taken into account?
 - Response – No, private wells were not considered in the summary of water and sewer capacity.
10. Is there a way to account for the effect the current drought might have on limitation of growth based on water availability or on how additional water might be supplied?
 - Response – The analysis does not treat water and wastewater system capacity as a constraint on overall maximum buildout. Water and sewer capacity are described in terms of existing demand, supply and distribution system, and capacity reserved for priority uses. While drought will be a highly important consideration for future water provision, it is not covered in this analysis.
11. The Midcoast Local Coastal Program was certified in 2012 rather than 2013 as noted in the report.
 - Response – This will be corrected in the report.
12. Please check the number of single family homes for Princeton in Table 9.
 - Response – This will be checked.
13. Table 6 has Pillar Ridge listed as “not at buildout” but it is.
 - Response – The team included a small number of units at Pillar Ridge as future rather than existing units; that will be corrected.
14. Where are Caretaker units and second units included in the Buildout analysis?
 - Response – Caretaker units are included in the multi-family units and second units are considered included in the single-family units.



15. Did the team use the County's Housing Element for the Buildout analysis? It has an alarming number of units.
 - Response – No, the Housing Element was not used for the Buildout Analysis.
16. How did the team predict the intensity for the M-1 zones?
 - Response – The existing ratio between floor area and site area is assumed for future M-1 development (0.4 FAR).
17. Most Midcoast residents travel to work in other parts of the county or to other counties. Was that taken into account in the travel forecasting and traffic analysis?
 - Response – Yes, the use of the C/CAG-VTA model recognizes the pattern of commute trips between the Midcoast and other parts of San Mateo County as well as other counties.
18. Will the DKS Team be doing additional Buildout analyses and travel forecasts in response to comments?
 - Response – Additional forecast of Buildout and its associated travel will be done in response to comments about the Task 2 work and after there has been an assessment of whether enough investment can be expected to provide transportation facilities and services that are sufficient to support the first cut at Buildout.
19. Is the analysis in Connect the Coastside taking into account potential sea-level rise?
 - Response – This has not entered into the initial analysis for Buildout, but the team will review any available information about predicted sea-level rise and reflect this in our analysis.
20. The Buildout should reflect a “worst-case” scenario to make sure that there are adequate facilities to provide good level of service and access and also to make sure there is adequate emergency response time.
 - Response – The team agrees and that was the purpose of the initial Buildout analysis.
21. Has the project taken into account the improvements that have been proposed in the past for SR 92 between I-280 and Half Moon Bay?
 - Response – The team is developing an inventory of potential improvement strategies that have been identified in previous studies and the potential SR 92 improvements are included. The team will evaluate these projects for their potential effect on roadway level of service and coastal access and will review the potential cost and support from Midcoast residents and businesses.
22. Why is the weekend and peak recreational LOS standard different (a worse level of service permitted)? Will Connect the Coastside consider a change in the standards? Will multi-modal standards be given consideration?
 - Response – The team is not entirely clear as to why the standards are different, except that the policy makers were probably willing to allow more crowding on weekends and during peak recreational periods. The team will be considering changes to the standards and will include consideration of multi-modal standards as possible recommendations from the project.



23. Is Caltrans willing to consider pedestrian crossings at non-signalized intersections?
 - Response – Caltrans is already working with the County on the possible addition of pedestrian crosswalks for at least one non-signalized intersection.

24. Near the Montara Light House where the Coastal Trail transitions from the west side of Highway 1 to the east side would be a good location for a pedestrian crosswalk at a non-signalized intersection.
 - Response – The team will consider a pedestrian crossing at this location.

25. There are locations where segments of bike trails come to SR 92 in close proximity but with no provisions on SR 92 for safe connection along SR 92. Will Connect the Coastside consider improvements on SR 92 that would add shoulders or bike lanes?
 - Response – The team will be considering improvements to bicycle mobility and safety such as this on SR 92 and on Highway 1.