January 17, 2015
Coastside the Coastside comments
submitted by Mike Jones, System & Regional Planning
Caltrans District 4, Oakland, CA

Reduction in VMT
The passage of AB 32, 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. Reducing VMT (Vehicle Miles Travelled) is part of this process and it is, therefore, not appropriate to simply plan for projected growth (even at LOS D).

Smart Mobility. In planning for future growth, serious effort must be made in reducing per capita vehicle miles traveled, including those *within* the study area. Every effort needs to be made to reduce the number of internal trips where possible by looking at alternative modes of travel and better linkages. Caltrans The Smart Mobility Framework (SMF), is a planning guide that furthers integration of smart growth concepts into transportation planning in California. SMF is uses "Location Efficiency" improve sustainability, though community design and regional connectivity. Solutions in SMF, and more specifically Caltrans' Main Street California guide, should be used as substitutes to simply meeting LOS targets.

No Planned Widening of SR 1 or SR 92. While Caltrans District 4 does not currently have an approved Transportation Corridor Report for either SR 1 or SR 92 it is not expected that there would be significant highway capacity increases on either of these routes to and from the Connecting the Coastside study area.

Shuttle vs. Bus. Current bus service **to/from** the study area are poor, with an irregular service to Caltrain (Bus #294) at Hillsdale, a final bus a 8:00pm and an even less frequent service at weekends. Along SR 1 the #17 bus also runs somewhat irregularly, but more importantly goes no further north than Linda Mar. Good transit access has a knock on benefit in reducing local car dependency; "Regional Accessibility" is one of the two tenants of Location Efficiency in Caltrans' SMF.

For tourists the Local Coastal Plan calls for a seasonal shuttle between I-280 and Half Moon Bay/Beaches but, overall, attractions in the area are low key and dispersed. A better solution would be introduce a regular SR 1 bus service from BART to Half Moon Bay, providing genuine connectivity from the north and acting as a de facto shuttle between the communities and beaches. This option would open up the study area to car free access from San Francisco (and beyond) and an extension to Simonstown/SF State might be worth consideration.

For commuters heading north, BART provides more robust connections (higher frequencies) and quicker trip times to San Francisco. On SR 92 Caltrans would be willing to look at bus by-pass facilities at SR 35 and I-280 if they could prove practical, and it is hoped that future increased Caltrain frequencies would improve connectively on this route. In the meantime an extension of existing services to the county seat at San Mateo would appear useful.

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. The Coastal Commission is already recommending that Caltrans consider

relocating Highway 1 inland at Pescadero and other sections of SR 1 could be closed by storms on a more frequent basis.

*__Roundabouts.__ Caltrans supports studying roundabouts where feasible (i.e. SR 92/SR 35). In fact, a new Policy Directive at Caltrans *requires* that roundabouts be included in all traffic control strategies being considered for intersection and interchange projects.
The installation of roundabouts can provide positive change:

- Safety – reduced number of crashes and severity compared to signalized intersections; eliminates head-on or broadside crashes.
- Operations – less delay and more capacity than signals, periodic retiming not necessary as with signals
- Cost Effective – potential to increase capacity without extensive structure work at intersections or lane additions at interchanges
- Accommodation of all users – slower vehicular speeds, shorter pedestrian crossings