



MEMORANDUM

TO: Rob Bartoli, San Mateo CTMP Project Manager
FROM: Bill Loudon and Joshua Pilachowski, DKS Associates
DATE: May 20, 2016
SUBJECT: Response to Comments from Connect the Coastsides Workshop #4 P No. 14075-000

CURRENT STATUS OF PROJECT

The DKS team developed a recommended alternative that included a range of transportation infrastructure improvements, land-use policies, and changes to standards used to identify transportation system performance deficiencies. The recommended alternative was described in detail and evaluated in the Recommended Alternative Evaluation Report and presented to the project TAC for their input. The report was revised and made public March 10 in preparation for presentations to the Midcoast Community Council, to the Half Moon Bay City Council and to the public workshop held April 7. The project team will use the comments to prepare a Final Recommended Alternative Evaluation Report and will initiate an environmental review of the recommended alternative. The environmental review will help the team make final refinements to the alternative before a Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan is drafted that includes an implementation plan.

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC INPUT REGARDING RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE

Public input based on the recommended alternative was received from spoken and written comments during the public workshop, from comments submitted to the project website, and from letters sent to the project staff from concerned citizens. The memorandum provides a summary of the comments received and the projects team's responses to the comments.

- **Comment:** Determine if a double-lane roundabout can be installed at Cypress instead of signalization
Response: Operationally, a double-lane roundabout will address the deficiency at Highway 1 at Cypress Avenue and there are no design concerns besides potentially needing some additional right-of-way for the roundabout. There could be potential environmental impacts for the expansion of the roadway footprint. If that is the case, the potential environmental impact and potential mitigation measures will be identified during the environmental review.



- **Comment:** A consistent tactile roadway edge would be preferable to “curb and gutter” on Highway 1 and local arterials.
Response: The proposed uniform curb and gutter can be modified to match the rural/fringe/village areas proposed in the Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Study
- **Comment:** The DKS cost estimates do not seem to be consistent with other cost estimates provided by the Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Study or the recent cost estimates from the Pedestrian Crossing Study.
Response: The cost estimates used in this study will be reviewed in an effort to reconcile them with the recently prepared cost estimates referenced. The disparity may have resulted from different assumptions or more land acquisition or environmental mitigation costs identified from more detailed design and environmental analyses not scoped for this portion of the project.
- **Comment:** The signalized intersection at Coronado Lane needs additional through lanes.
Response: Additional through lanes can be added, similar to the improvement identified at Ruisseau Francois Avenue.
- **Comment:** Portions of the Coastal Trail should be left as dirt and the decision where this should be done should be left to a community-planning effort.
Response: This can be done. The project team will consider changing the Coastal Trail to a “circulation/safety improvement” instead of a “deficiency improvement” because sufficient bicycle facilities are provided by the Parallel Trail to satisfy the recommended Bicycle Environmental Quality Index (BEQI) standard.
- **Comment:** Refuges should be used instead of flashing-beacon crosswalks at proposed pedestrian crosswalks because they are safer and impact traffic less.
Response: The majority of identified crossing locations at intersections have left-turn lanes and refuges cannot be installed without widening the roadway and installing a median between the receiving lane and left-turn lane. Thinner, recessed refuges often fill up with gravel and road debris and become unusable. The preferred solution of an elevated refuge with ramps would require an additional 16-foot median.
- **Comment:** There is a huge need to address pedestrian “jaywalking” at Grey Whale Cove and Surfer’s Beach which slow traffic on weekends.
Response: Designated pedestrian crossing locations will help to concentrate pedestrian crossings at specific locations to address the problem of jaywalking and minimize the effect it has on traffic. The recommended improvements include a crossing location at Grey Whale Cover and Surfer’s Beach.
- **Comment:** The location for the diagonal parking proposed in El Granada has not been made available.
Response: The proposed diagonal parking in El Granada is part of the larger El



Granada Highway 1 coastal erosion plan presented in the Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study (Phase 1) document. The recommendation included in this project is that the addition of the parking in El Granada happen regardless of the approval of the other elements included in that plan, but a specific location for the diagonal parking has not been identified..

- **Comment:** Has this project been finalized or is there any remaining recourse to any of the proposed improvements? After the CTMP has been approved, can alternatives to the proposed improvements be studied in the future?
Response: The CTMP still needs to be finalized and approved by the Board of Supervisors. Input from this public meeting will be considered in determining the final set of recommended improvements. The CTMP will also include a plan for funding and implementing the specific improvements recommended by this study will and the process of implementation over time will include opportunities for additional input.
- **Comment:** The DKS analysis (specifically at Cypress Avenue) does not address Big Wave traffic.
Response: The analysis is performed at a planning level and does not concentrate on specific lots or planned projects. The potential Big Wave development traffic is within the new development traffic modeled in the Constrained Development Forecast.
- **Comment:** Don't install any stoplights or pedestrian crosswalks. Fix the actual problems.
Response: Based on the existing and proposed standards, stoplights and pedestrian crosswalks are the improvements that most efficiently address the deficiencies.
- **Comment:** Install a stoplight with pedestrian crossing at Miramar Drive.
Response: Miramar Drive did not have enough side-street volume to meet a traffic signal warrant, however a pedestrian crossing is proposed at the adjacent intersection of Highway 1 with Mirada Road.
- **Comment:** The project should give more consideration to the recommendations in the Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Study.
Response: The recommendations in the Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Study were considered, and the proposed improvements that meet the objectives of the study were included. This project does not invalidate any non-conflicting recommendations.
- **Comment:** The project does not propose enough transit improvements. We need more transit, maybe a bus expressway/lane. Better connections to regional transit.
Response: The recommended improvements from this project are based on the ability of the infrastructure to handle the increased demand from growth. The existing transit infrastructure and services more than serves the existing transit demand, and the 2040 does not forecast enough increase in transit ridership to



warrant additional service. The evidence from elsewhere in the other semi-rural parts of the Bay Area is that transit service provides additional mobility and travel choices for area residents and visitors, but does not result in any significant reduction in auto use.

- **Comment:** Adjust traffic flow in downtown Half Moon Bay with one-way streets to control traffic flow between Highway 1, SR-92, and Main Street.
Response: The project team will discuss this option with the City of Half Moon Bay staff and conduct analysis of its potential benefits and impacts.
- **Comment:** Signal coordination doesn't improve really improve traffic flow. Can more evidence be provided of its expected effectiveness?
Response: Signal coordination is a commonly used strategy to maximize the flow of traffic and reduce the incidence of multiple stops experienced by individual drivers. Reducing the number of stops and maintaining constant speeds also has the benefit of improving safety and reducing read end collisions. More information on the benefits of signal coordination can be found in a document provided by the Federal Highway Administration:
http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/intersection/other_topics/fhwasa08008/sa4_Signal_Coordination.pdf
- **Comment:** Increasing the Delay Index standard on Highway 1 based on multimodal use doesn't fix the problem.
Response: A higher standard for the Delay Index for a "multimodal" roadway is intended to provide some flexibility to accommodate walking, bicycling and transit use with improvements for these modes without violating a county performance standard.
- **Comment:** Highway 1 needs to be four lanes along the study area and no development should be allowed until this is done.
Response: The Connect the Coastside team has tried to make context sensitive recommendations. While widening Highway 1 to four lanes throughout the study area would improve peak period travel times on Highway 1, this is not necessary to meet the level of service standards for the roadway. The project team has recommended roadway widening only where it would be necessary to meet the standards.
- **Comment:** The plan should have fewer pedestrian crossings across Highway 1. Undercrossings should be proposed instead.
Response: The proposed density of pedestrian crossings is already low. If pedestrian crossings are spaced farther apart, it could lead to more pedestrians and bicyclist crossing at of uncontrolled locations, which could lead more collisions with pedestrians and bicyclists. Undercrossing were not recommended because they are significantly more expensive, require more land, have potentially greater environment impacts, are prone to flooding, are difficult to keep clean and are generally not desired by pedestrians and bicyclists.



- **Comment:** Move the proposed pedestrian walkways from Ave Alhambra to Obsipo Road because people are more likely to walk there.
Response: The majority of commercial land use in El Granada is located along Ave Alhambra, suggesting a greater potential demand for pedestrian traffic. That is why it is proposed as the location of the walkways. Obsipo Road does not have any comparable land use.
- **Comment:** BEQI/PEQI standards are more applicable to urban/grid environments.
Response: The BEQI and PEQI standards used in Connect the Coastside are based on index parameters that relate them specifically to the semi-rural nature of the Coastside. They are also based on the expected amount of pedestrian and bicycle use that is expected. The use of performance standards for pedestrian and bicycle facilities is fairly new, and the research by the Connect the Coastside team did not identify any standards that were more oriented to semi-rural areas.
- **Comment:** Convert Ruisseau Francois Avenue to a roundabout instead of the proposed stacking lanes, and return Kehoe Avenue to the previously proposed roundabout.
Response: Signalizing Kehoe Avenue was at the request of the city of Half Moon Bay. The effect of conversion of Ruisseau Francois Avenue to a roundabout will be examined by the project team.
- **Comment:** The Kehoe Avenue signalization can be avoided if the Half Moon Bay proposed improvements and signalization at Terrace Avenue and Grand Boulevard are modified to include an extended frontage road to accommodate traffic from Kehoe Avenue.
Response: The project team will discuss this option with the City of Half Moon Bay staff and check the effect of the modification on level of service.
- **Comment:** Sea level rise in El Granada needs to be addressed.
Response: Sea level rise is a legitimate concern for portions of the Coastside. Analyses of the locations on Highway 1 most prone to sea level rise are being evaluated by Caltrans and appropriate recommendations are being developed independent of this project.
- **Comment:** Are there any proposed solutions to address the delay in north Half Moon Bay? The signals in Half Moon Bay need to be coordinated.
Response: There is a signal coordination project for the signals in downtown half Moon Bay currently underway that was included in the recommended improvements, however no other feasible solutions were identified.
- **Comment:** Trucks on SR-92 should be restricted to the right-lane only. They tend to use the left-lanes to pass other slower moving trucks and in doing so slow traffic even more.
Response: The existing two-lane section of SR-92 currently has “trucks use right



lane” and “slower traffic keep right” signs. The recommended improvements include the installation of additional signs encouraging truck traffic to use the right lane.

- **Comment:** A roundabout at SR-92/Lower Skyline (SR-35) may have potential environmental concerns associated with it.
Response: Any potential environmental impacts and necessary mitigations will be identified during the environmental analysis portion of the project.
- **Comment:** The Coastal Commission has stated that adding parking charges at Midcoast beaches is a social justice issue and should not be pursued.
Response: Consideration of the potential social-justice impacts of instituting parking charges at Midcoast beaches will be addressed in the environmental review.
- **Comment:** The definition of lots available for lot retirement should be changed and should not include undevelopable lots. Lot retirement doesn’t make sense if the number of developable lots doesn’t decrease. Issues with paper subdivisions.
Response: The proposed land use policies are designed to be reasonable and fair for land owners while also resulting in some reduction in the total amount of development.
- **Comment:** Maximum allowable house size on the Midcoast should be reduced.
Response: The travel forecasts and the traffic analysis for Connect the Coastside have used assumptions about the average house sized allowed by zoning. The constraints on the amount of new development and the land-use policies recommended will achieve the development control desired.
- **Comment:** When will full buildout occur and what will the population and traffic volume be at that time?
Response: There is no specific horizon year associated with full buildout, however regional growth at 2040 was assumed for the analysis.
- **Comment:** This project needs to present the analysis and results in language that anyone can understand.
Response: The Project Team has undertaken additional review and refinement to make sure that the final products of the project are clear and easy to understand.



- **Comment:** The current Half Moon Bay LCP policy allows only a 1% increase in housing units a year. How many permits have been issued each year since the policy was put into place and how is the permit process managed?

Response: The City of Half Moon Bay has an annual allocation process in place, where each year City Council approves a total number of potential allocations based on the previous year's population. Residential developments have to apply for and receive an allocation in order to move forward in the CDP process. Since the start of Measure D in 2010, the following number of certificates have been issued each year (representing approximately 20-25% of available allocations in recent years according to staff reports):

Year	Number of Allocations Issued
2010	8
2011	6
2012	8
2013	7
2014	20
2015	14
2016	6
Total	69