

From: Ina Gerhard <ina.gerhard@dot.ca.gov>
To: James Hinkamp <jhinkamp@smcgov.org>
Date: 1/19/2015
Subject: RE: CTMP TAC Meeting #2 Recap (1/7/2015) - Caltrans comments

Hi James,

Please find below our comments on the December 23, 2014 DKS memo on the Draft Determination and Evaluation of Alternatives for the San Mateo County Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to review.

Ina Gerhard
Office of System and Regional Planning
CA Department of Transportation, District 4
Oakland, CA 94612. MS 10C
Phone: 510-286-5598

Description of the alternatives

The description of alternatives is confusing as they are defined by low, medium and high cost/impact. However, Alternative 2 (medium cost/impact) includes Alternative 1 low cost/impact improvements and Alternative 3 includes low and medium cost/impact improvements that are included in Alternatives 1 and 2. The memorandum states (page 4) that the end result of the alternatives analysis will be a hybrid alternative, potentially taking improvements from multiple alternatives. This is in fact what is described by Alternative 2 and 3 - improvements from multiple alternatives. Please clarify the difference between Alternatives 2 and 3 and the hybrid alternative to be developed.

Evaluation of alternatives and Smart Mobility

The passage of AB 32

[http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf](http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/pub/05-06/bill/asm/ab_0001-0050/ab_0001-0050_ab_32_bill_20060927_chaptered.pdf)

the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, requires California to reduce its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 — a reduction of approximately 15 percent below emissions expected under a “business as usual” scenario. In planning for future growth, efforts must be made towards reducing per capita vehicle miles travelled (VMT) within each community through community design and improvements in bicycle and pedestrian networks, and regional trips through much improved regional transit connectivity. Caltrans' Smart Mobility Framework (SMF)

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/tpp/offices/ocp/documents/smf_files/SMF_handbook_062210.pdf

is a planning guide that furthers integration of smart growth concepts into transportation planning in California. SMF uses “Location Efficiency” to develop sustainable transportation solutions. SMF and Caltrans' Main Street, California guide could be used as substitutes to simply meeting LOS targets. Improvements strategies and projects should be evaluated and prioritized based on their potential to reduce VMT.

Transit service improvements

“Regional Accessibility” is one of the two tenants of Location Efficiency in Caltrans' SMF. Current bus service to/from the study area is poor, with irregular service connecting with Caltrain (#294) at Hillsdale, a final bus at 8:00 PM and a less frequent service on weekends. Along Highway 1 the #17 bus also runs somewhat irregularly and terminates at Linda Mar in

Pacifica.

For tourists the Local Coastal Plan calls for a seasonal shuttle between I-280 and Half Moon Bay and the beaches, but overall attractions in the area may be too low key and dispersed for a shuttle service to work. Another solution could be to introduce a regular Route 1 bus service between BART and Half Moon Bay, providing genuine connectivity to/from the north and acting as a de facto shuttle between the communities and beaches. Commuters heading north would also benefit from the connection to BART with its higher frequencies and quicker trip times to San Francisco. This option would open up the study area to car free access to San Francisco (and beyond).

To improve transit efficiency along SR 92, bus by-pass facilities should be considered for example at SR 35 and I-280 or other locations. Increased Caltrain frequencies would improve connectivity between the coast and the north-south corridor along the Peninsula. And an extension of existing services to the county seat at San Mateo would appear useful.

Roundabouts

Roundabouts would need to be studied at all proposed signalized intersection locations, per 2013 Department Policy Directive: <http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/policy/13-02.pdf> . This policy acknowledges the safety (reduced number of crashes and crash severity compared to signalized intersections; elimination of head-on or broadside crashes; shorter pedestrian crossings) and operational benefits (less delay and more capacity than signalized intersections) that roundabouts can provide as well as the potential for cost savings.

Sea Level Rise

While it is not predicted that sea level rise will result in inundation along the San Mateo coast, waves along various locations of Route 1 are eroding the bluffs and migrating toward the roadway. If sea level rise develops as anticipated, the depths and resulting waves will be larger and erosion rates accelerated. Will vulnerable locations in the Midcoast and Half Moon Bay study area be identified as part of this study and considered in the development of the Plan?

Appendix A

In the notes section of the spreadsheet, reference is made to other projects. Are these projects separate (ongoing and funded projects) from the Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan or would they be projects to be built under one of the three alternatives?