



MEMORANDUM

TO: Rob Bartoli, San Mateo CTMP Project Manager
FROM: Bill Loudon, DKS Associates
DATE: November 18, 2015
SUBJECT: Minutes of SMC CTMP Workshop #3 P No. 14075-000
October 22, 2015

Staff Present

Rob Bartoli, San Mateo County
Nicholas Calderon, Office of Supervisor Horsley
Josh Pilachowski, DKS
Peter Winch, Dyett & Bhatia
Kendall Flint, Public Outreach Manager

Presentation Summary

This was the third public workshop for the San Mateo County Comprehensive Transportation Management Plan Project – *Connect the Coastside*. The agenda included discussion on the revised development forecast and a set of proposed alternative standards to identify transportation deficiencies.

Revised Development Forecast

Rob Bartoli presented a summary of the modifications made to the zoning-based buildout analysis that has incorporated updated data and assumptions, including corrections to data regarding existing and proposed development, and reconsideration of employment density assumptions to more realistically match typical conditions.

Peter Winch described the project subareas as the unincorporated rural areas of San Mateo County south of the Devil's Slide to Princeton-by-the-Sea, to the southern extent of the incorporated area of the City of Half Moon Bay. Modifications constitute a constrained development potential forecast, taking into consideration the growth management limitations contained in the San Mateo County Midcoast Local Coastal Plan and the City of Half Moon Bay's Measure D, and market demand for new housing and non-residential development in Half Moon Bay based on an analysis conducted in 2014 for the Half Moon Bay General Plan Update. Constraints related to water and sewer capacity under current public works and urban water management plans, and the Midcoast LCP were not considered as determinants to long-term transportation and land use planning because such potential constraints may be adjusted over time. Development trends in the unincorporated Midcoast and Half Moon Bay between 1990 and 2015; and



Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) projections for growth in the unincorporated Midcoast and Half Moon Bay to the year 2040, were also reviewed but not included in the constrained development potential estimate. As adjusted, housing is projected to increase by 22% by 2040 (25-year horizon). With respect to non-residential development, the constrained forecast results in 165 fewer jobs in the unincorporated Midcoast and 2,672 fewer jobs in Half Moon Bay compared to zoning-based buildout.

Proposed Alternative Standards

Josh Pilachowski stated that existing standards for the study area are focused only on the automobile mode and do not consider the corridor-based environment of the roadway network. As a result, deficiencies are identified at facilities that are operating as desired, such as at low-volume minor streets that experience delays in order to maintain flow along Highway 1.

There are no standards to identify deficiencies in parking availability, and inadequate parking often causes parking to spillover into residential areas. The Project Team is recommending that existing roadway segments and intersection standards be revised to provide exemptions for facilities that do not have significant minor approach volumes and for those that prioritize alternative modes of transportation. Multimodal standards should be implemented to identify deficiencies that occur as increased automotive demand hinders the ability of pedestrian and bicycle to operate safely and efficiently. Standards that identify deficiencies in transit and parking services that do not adequately meet demand should be established.

The San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan includes a Pedestrian index that considers a combination of variables that affect the pedestrian experience. The City/County of San Francisco uses a Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index (PEQI). The Project Team is recommending that a standard based on the PEQI apply to locations along Highway 1 that have pedestrian demands as defined by the County's pedestrian index. Accordingly, segments along Highway 1 with a higher concentration of pedestrians would be considered deficient if they did not provide a safe area for pedestrians to walk away from traffic.

Similarly, San Francisco has established the Bicycle Environmental Quality Index (BEQI) that provides a method for establishing standards for bicycle facilities based on safety, vehicle traffic, street design, and land use. The Project Team is recommending that a similar standard be established for bicycle travel along Highway 1, together with a standard that designates bicycle storage at any beach access point.

SamTrans does not currently have any maximum load factor guidelines for transit routes, but the agency does identify routes with low ridership for potential removal. San Francisco has set a standard of 85% maximum capacity utilization for Muni service across certain neighborhood entry points during peak hours. To avoid overcrowding transit services, the Project Team is recommending that a standard be established for the capacity of bus usage within the study area not to exceed a two-hour average of 85% during the weekday commute peak period and the weekend recreational peak period.



SamTrans has existing ridership standards for benches and shelters at bus stops, however, the Project Team recommends that the standard for the study area recognize a lower transit demand in the rural coastal setting and provide safe and comfortable bus stops for transit users accordingly.

Parking availability is often measured within a 1/4 mile distance of the land use as it represents the distance most people are willing to walk to access a destination. To ensure that there is adequate parking at Coastside recreational facilities and other attractions, the Project Team is recommending a standard that provides any beach access point would have no more than 85% parking occupancy during an average weekend midday peak within 1/4 mile of the recreational parking facilities.

Summary of Public Comments with Staff Response

- Will this Project work within the adopted (County) LCP or will the LCP be amended to incorporate this Project?

Response: The Project Team is not recommending that the LCP be amended, but may recommend that the standards that serve to implement the LCP be adjusted.

- Development trends since 1990 don't factor in the financial anomalies that occurred in 2008

Response: While the development trends were used as part of the big-picture analysis of growth in the study area, they were not used to estimate constrained development potential partially based on the issues that were raised. The growth initiatives (e.g., Measure D in Half Moon Bay) are however taken into consideration.

- The data is flawed by the lack of sewer capacity and the moratorium that ended in 1999, which tend to minimize impacts of growth.

Response: Similar to the development trends, the sewer and water constraints were used to look at the big picture, but were not used to estimate constrained development potential because of the potential for them to change over time.

- Will lowering the standards on the Coastside allow more growth?

Response: The adjustments to the standards only looking to address deficiencies and are neither pro nor con toward development.

- The lack of adequate bicycle facilities between Linda Mar and the Tunnel create a "death trap."

Response: The proposed bicycle standards will assist in the identification of unsafe areas such as this.



- Will this policy document have an effect or influence Caltrans project plans?

Response: This document will provide direction to the County, which can help convince the state to modify Caltrans projects.

- Why do the development assumptions provide more non-residential use in the unincorporated area and less within the City?

Response: The assumption is based on the market study (2014) prepared for the Half Moon Bay General Plan update. There is not a similar market study for the unincorporated so that forecast continues to be based on the best data we have available.

- Does the multi-family residential account for higher density development?

Response: Residential density calculations are derived from zoning designations and not from specific parcels.

- Good to be less auto-centric

- Is the market study prepared for the City's GPA available for public review?

Response: The study is part of the City's update process and is part of the public record, although not on the City's website. We will contact the City and request that it to be made available through our website.

- Will the methodology and data used to evaluate the travel time and delay index be available?

Response: The methodology and data will be made available as part of the upcoming reports when the analysis has been completed.

- Alternative modes need to be adjusted to accommodate an aging population. Do any of the proposed standards address the needs of those residents?

Response: The PEQI was specifically made to address the needs of pedestrians when identifying deficiencies in pedestrian facilities.

- The Coastal Commission requires that the LCP address buildout, not a 25-year horizon. How will these assumptions comply?

Response: The transportation model will address buildout as well as the 25-year horizon.

- The transportation system can't be engineered to accommodate existing traffic. The traffic levels today exceed any reasonable improvement.

- The Project needs to factor in the effect of out-of-town traffic on the local system.

Response: The model used to create the constrained and buildout forecast in a regional model which includes Bay Area regional traffic. There is no specific weekend model, however based on the comparison of counts



observed for existing commuter and weekend peak hours, the forecast results are adjusted to match expected weekend regional growth.

- Clarify the terms “permitted” and “permissible” – not all permitted uses may be permitted by the Coastal Commission, which won’t allow “expansion” unless improvements are made.

Response: Policy 1.23 in the Midcoast LCP permits residential development in the unincorporated Midcoast to 40 units per year. Each housing unit must comply with LCP, Zoning, and General Plan regulation.

- Thanks for addressing other alternatives
- What assures that the assumptions are accurate?

Response: The assumptions have been reviewed and acknowledged by a Technical Advisory Committee made up of technical staff from multiple stakeholders.

- How is this meeting being recorded?

Response: The comments are being transcribed. MCC has offered the funding and equipment to record and video tape future meetings.

- Is the data shown in Slide 13 GIS-based? Likewise, do Slides 30 & 31 include pedestrian criteria? Slide 36 needs to add other parking facilities.

Response: The exhibits reflect information derived from the existing County bike plan. The next stage of the Project will include an evaluation of that information and will be updated accordingly.

- Transit standards are not attainable because service is so low, it will never rise to the minimum levels.

Response: While the standards are demand based, we have previously recommended improvements that include an increase to transit frequency and coverage.

- When will SamTrans get involved?

Response: There has been an active member of the Technical Advisory Committee from SamTrans. Recommendations will be made to the County Board of Supervisors, which does not have the authority to direct SamTrans actions.

- What’s being done with public restrooms?

Response: Such improvements are not within the purview of this project.

- A standard promoting commuter access should be added.

Response: Commuter access will be addressed through standards relating to peak period delay and transit service.



- Residential growth in the City exceeds the percentage allowed by Measure D.

Response: Residential growth has not exceeded 1.5% in any recent year.

- This study is not considering exceptions to Measure D.

Response: Constraints incurred from zoning restrictions impose more restrictions than Measure D provisions.

- The locations identified for the parking standard are not comprehensive and have left off multiple parking lots, including Pillar Point and the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve.

Response: We will add any additional County and Half Moon Bay owned and controlled parking lots to the figure. This project does not have any jurisdiction over any Federal, Harbor District, or Privately controlled lots.

Next Steps

Upcoming meetings are:

- Workshop #4 (Revised Transportation Alternatives) – March 2016