



Half Moon Bay General Plan and LCP Update
General Plan Advisory Committee Meeting #14
Emergency Operations Center, 537 Kelly Avenue, Half Moon Bay, CA 94019
December 15, 2016 | 6:30pm

Meeting Notes

Materials for this meeting can be found at www.planhmb.org/general-plan-library.html.

Project Overview: Project Status and Schedule

- Reviewed notification and agenda availability and format:
 - Notification for this session was similar to previous sessions and included: Half Moon Bay ENews (multiple notifications), Plan Half Moon Bay email (multiple notifications), Next Door website posting, press notification, www.planHMB.org project web page, and announcements at a City Council and Planning Commission session.
 - Agenda Availability: Posted electronically on City of Half Moon Bay web page calendar and www.planHMB.org; and posted hard copy December 1, 2016 at City Hall.

- Reviewed schedule and project status.

- Reviewed agreements from previous session on November 17, 2016:
 - Summary Notes – GPAC acknowledgment of summary notes from November 17 session – no requests for changes made.
 - Topics for Discussion – GPAC members were asked to submit discussion topics a week before the upcoming sessions to provide staff the opportunity to prepare materials to support the discussion. Two members did so for this session.

- Reviewed approaches to GPAC review:
 - Scope: Do the draft documents identify all of the topics and relationships between them?
 - Intent: Does the narrative tell the story? Do the policy statements reflect the intended direction?
 - Detail: Context for how detailed comments may be most productive; example: Draft Policy 3-I.75 Highway 1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Route – Different comments received regarding this policy address scope, intent, and different levels of details. Staff described ways that two aspects of the policy could be amended based to address these comments as illustrated below with ~~strike through~~ and underline:

3-I.75 Highway 1 Pedestrian and Bicycle Routes for Northeast Neighborhoods. Study alignments, design and implement a multi-purpose trail or path dedicated for pedestrian and bicycle circulation serving neighborhoods and destinations north of SR 92 with the preferred alignment adjacent and parallel to ~~on~~ the east side of Highway 1. The alignment should provide a connection(s) between neighborhoods and Half Moon Bay High School, Cunha Intermediate School, and Downtown.

Draft General Plan Elements:

The presentation provided an overview of the Noise and Circulation Elements including key policy questions for the GPAC and community members to consider as they review the documents:

Noise Element: Note that these slides were presented at the previous session and made available for the December 15, 2016 session in the event that they would support GPAC discussion.

- Highlights of Topics Covered:
 - Noise Standards
 - Interior
 - Exterior
 - Noise Evaluations for New Land Uses
 - Receptors
 - Generators - Leq - hourly measure
 - CNEL - More sensitive to nighttime noise
 - Thresholds of Significance for CEQA purposes
 - Vibration
- Key Policy Choices
 - Soundwalls - when are they acceptable?
 - Between properties
 - Along roadways
 - Remodels - Encourage or mandate?
 - Insulation and/or new windows
 - Align with State energy conservation requirements in the Building Ordinance
 - Sensitive uses:
 - Interior - 45 dBA
 - Exterior - 60 dBA

Circulation Element:

- Key Policy Choices Discussed:
 - Alternate Routes
 - The Character of Highway 1
 - Performance Standards
- Alternate Routes:
 - The First Public Draft Circulation Element addresses alternate parallel routes for pedestrians and bicycles and not vehicles. This language and

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #14 Summary

intent was thoroughly presented to the GPAC at their October 13, 2016 session.

- GPAC members requested that the concept for Foothill Boulevard as presented in the now superseded 1992 Circulation Element be brought back for discussion by the GPAC. Staff presented the reasons why it was not part of the first public draft Circulation Element.
 - Feasibility: Foothill Boulevard as described and shown in the 1992 Circulation Element is no longer feasible specifically because the Pacific Ridge settlement agreement to which the City is a part, determines that it will no longer be pursued. Furthermore, the subdivision design does not accommodate the alignment. The land in the vicinity of the alignment is privately held and a portion of it will become dedicated as open space for conservation purposes.
 - Environmental Concerns: Wetlands and other ESHAs are present in the general vicinity of the alignment. Noise and aesthetics are additional important environmental issues.
 - Community Preference: Community members have overwhelmingly expressed that they prefer an alternate route for bicycles and pedestrians to provide connections between the neighborhoods in northeast Half Moon Bay and various destination. They are very concerned about any route for vehicles, especially one that would introduce neighborhood cut through traffic.
- Character of Highway 1:
 - Width and number of lanes
 - Crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists
 - Other considerations: speed, roundabouts
- Proposed Improvements:
 - Maps of the proposed roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements were provided to GPAC members and the community.

GPAC Clarifying Questions, Public Comment and GPAC Discussion:

To support the GPAC's discussion, three maps were provided to GPAC members and attendees in 11x17 color format: Land Use Diagram, Existing and Proposed Bicycle and Pedestrian Network, and Coastal Access and Roadway Improvements. The maps are included in the First Public Draft LUP and Circulation Element.

The GPAC discussion incorporated public comment. The following questions, comments and discussion points were made throughout the remainder of the GPAC session following the staff presentation:

- A GPAC member opened the discussion of Foothill Boulevard. The member acknowledged that although the original intent for Foothill is no longer viable, other

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #14 Summary

configurations or combinations may be possible. Throughout the discussion that followed, members of the community and GPAC suggested a number of alternatives for a parallel vehicular route including:

- Frenchmans Creek Road Terminus: Frenchmans Creek Road could be the northern terminus of the parallel roadway, instead of an eastern extension of Young Avenue as originally considered. The original configuration would require a new crossing of environmentally sensitive Frenchmans Creek.
 - SR 92 Intersection Relocation: SR 92 intersection could be located farther east than the originally mapped Foothill Boulevard alignment.
 - Lewis Foster Drive: The existing roadway could serve as the southern end of the parallel roadway route instead of a direct connection to SR 92, which would require a new signalized intersection.
 - Half Moon Bay High School Roadway: The existing roadway immediately east of the school, which can be accessed from Lewis Foster Drive, could serve as a portion of the southern end of the parallel roadway. A community member noted that for the recently conducted grading work at Pacific Ridge, construction vehicles accessed the site via this route (instead of Highland Avenue) and that it was effective for that purpose.
 - Neighborhood Connection Only: A limited scope parallel vehicular route connecting existing neighborhoods along their eastern extents – and not directly connecting to Highway 1 or SR 92 - might be less prone to attracting cut-through neighborhood traffic and would allow for significantly more mobility between neighborhoods.
 - Eastern Alignment in Unincorporated San Mateo County: An alignment farther east toward/into the foothills outside the City limits may be less impactful to neighborhoods.
 - Frontage Road: Instead of an alignment east of the neighborhoods, plan for a new frontage road adjacent to Highway 1.
 - Golden Gate Drive: Connect Half Moon Bay's northeastern neighborhoods via an extension of Golden Gate Drive as envisioned in the 1992 Circulation Element, although this is very unlikely and has similar constraints because of private property ownership and ESHA.
 - Concept Only: Several GPAC members expressed that they would like to keep the concept of a parallel vehicular route in the Circulation Element so as to not rule out options in the future, including technologies that are not yet available.
- GPAC and community members also suggested alternatives to a parallel route for vehicles, preferring options other than a new roadway. These included revised alignments and configurations of existing roadways and new linkages and facilities for alternate modes not otherwise presented in the first public draft Circulation Element, such as these:
 - Silver Avenue Connection: Silver Avenue could be connected to allow northbound Highway 1 traffic to make right turns onto the street.
 - Pedestrian and Bicycle Parallel Route: Instead of a roadway for vehicles, the parallel route concept based on the Foothill Boulevard alignment could be a multi-use trail for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #14 Summary

- Bicycle Circulation: Emphasize bike trails and linkages throughout the city as alternatives to a parallel route. One GPAC member expressed that the discussion of bicycle transportation as an alternative is a distraction from the parallel route topic because no one is biking. Others suggested that more biking for school commuting was possible and that Safe Routes to School programs will provide opportunities. It was noted that even a few trips shifted from auto mode to bicycling can make a difference in roadway congestion conditions. Pacific Grove was cited as a good example for how an interconnected and well marketed bicycle network can serve a local coastal community well.
- GPAC and community members confirmed and elaborated upon the staff presentation with respect to the infeasibility of establishing Foothill Boulevard as originally envisioned or in a similar alignment. Comments included the following:
 - Pacific Ridge's Coastal Development Permit, settlement agreement, subdivision design, and open space dedication do not accommodate or allow Foothill Boulevard and it would be very costly to revise and any such revisions would likely not be approvable.
 - An additional signalized intersection would cause problems on SR 92.
 - Wetlands are present.
 - Pacific Ridge was designed to have one point of entry and exit and not to connect to another roadway.
 - Any concept for a parallel route for vehicles in and of itself will allow cut through neighborhood traffic. Cannot support anything that routes Highway 1 traffic through neighborhoods.
 - The City can't support providing infrastructure to support the 67% of employed residents who commute to jobs out of town.
 - The community's opinion about a parallel route for vehicles was presented by a community member as irrelevant because the route is infeasible regardless. It cannot be legally implemented and an open space easement granted in perpetuity for conservation lands cannot be developed with a roadway.
- Public Perception of Traffic Volumes: A GPAC member described that although many community members frequently complain about local traffic congestion, that it is only when the roadways are extremely impacted such as they are during Pumpkin Festival, that locals opt to ride their bikes or walk. Perhaps traffic congestion has to get worse to affect long term behavioral changes. A community member expressed that the "pain point" to avoid driving occurs from about 3:00 – 7:00 PM.
- Parallel Trail: A community member described the concept for a multi-modal "Parallel Trail" for bicyclists and pedestrians which was originally intended for implementation adjacent to the east side of Highway 1 through all of Half Moon Bay and north to and through the unincorporated Midcoast communities. The Circulation Element includes this parallel trail segment from the north end of the city to SR 92. The Element should be revised to include the alignment on the east side of Highway 1 to the southern City limits.
- Transit Hub: Community and GPAC members discussed possibilities for a transit hub. It was noted that the park-and-ride lot behind Safeway is not well known. Interest in linking park-and-ride, bus, shuttle, bike lockers, and walking access at a convenient centralized location would benefit both residents and visitors. Consider grants and

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #14 Summary

also simple solutions such as that in San Luis Obispo where a transit hub is effectively operating from two street corners.

- **Terrace Avenue and Highway 1 Signalized Intersection:** A community member cited concern regarding draft policy 3-I.41 about signalization of Highway 1 at Terrace Avenue, along with road widening and an extension of Frontage Road on the west side of the highway. There is concern that this improvement would interfere with the Naomi Patridge trail bicycle route. The highway cannot be widened to four lanes in this area. Instead, the design should remove the pinch point to Grandview or the next street.
- **Complete Streets:** A GPAC member discussed that there are many favorable elements of the complete streets approach; however, they also expressed concern that standard implementation, such as curbs and gutters, could interfere with heritage trees.
- **Sidewalk Maintenance:** GPAC and community members discussed the City's sidewalk maintenance approach. A GPAC member described how other cities address this matter. In addition to sidewalks, street tree maintenance was also noted as a related concern. Incoming City Council Member Harvey Rarback announced that the City Council would be taking up this topic at their February 7, 2017 session and encouraged everyone to participate.
- **Traffic Calming:** GPAC members expressed support for neighborhood traffic calming programs, especially those tailored specifically to each condition.
- **Traffic Circulation Downtown:** A GPAC member expressed concern that other than the policy language for a transit hub, traffic and circulation in the Downtown core is not specifically addressed.
- **Signalized Intersection Performance:** A GPAC member noted that signalized intersections appear to have better level of service (LOS) than un-signalized. Others noted that this is usually because of the improved performance for side streets, but not for the main thoroughfare.
- **School Start Times:** A GPAC member noted that school start times could be adjusted to avoid the brunt of the morning and afternoon peak traffic periods. The GPAC member wanted text added to the element identifying that heavy traffic is a cause of traffic congestion. Thus, offsetting school commute traffic from other peak periods would be beneficial.
- **SR 92 East of Town:** A GPAC member noted that the performance of SR 92 outside the city limits has a significant effect on circulation in Half Moon Bay. Some businesses operations in particular are associated with unsafe pedestrian crossings of SR 92 and cause significant backups into town.
- **Electric Vehicles and Greener Transportation:** A GPAC member was concerned that electric vehicles are not addressed in the draft Circulation Element. Another GPAC member encouraged inclusion of EV charging stations at visitor serving uses such as State beach parking lots.
- **Red Light Running:** A GPAC member asked if red light runs are considered in modeling intersection performance.
- **Alternate Performance Standards:** GPAC and community members discussed examples of standards for pedestrian and other circulation modes. In particular, the San Mateo County Connect the Coastside work includes several new performance standard concepts. There was mixed feedback about the various standards.

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #14 Summary

- **Street Typologies:** GPAC members responded with interest to the concept of street typologies as another approach to alternate performance standards as described by staff during the session. One GPAC member noted that Kelly and Poplar are examples where the draft Circulation Element appears to treat the two streets the same. These streets serve different land uses and have different functions, configurations, and traffic volumes. The street typologies approach may be helpful for addressing situation like this as well as for considering coastal access.
- **New Trails and Paths – Limitation on Location:** A GPAC member noted that the draft Circulation Element includes concepts for new trails adjacent to riparian corridors. Feasibility may be limited because of environmental constraints; however, it remains possible without riparian aligned trails to develop an interconnected trail network.
- **Multi-Modal Circulation Gaps:** A GPAC member notes that there are gaps between different alternate transportation modes. Examples include: bikes not being allowed on shuttles and shuttle buses not operating during peak periods.
- **Relationship to the Coastal Act:** A GPAC member noted that many of the draft Circulation Element policies seem to be relevant to the Coastal Act.
- **Highway 1 Configuration:** The GPAC would like the discussion of four-lane Highway 1 segments brought back to future sessions.
- **Concepts for Highway 1 Crossings:** A GPAC member expressed interest in grade separated crossings of Highway 1 for pedestrians and bicyclists, especially undercrossings. Undercrossings would be safe for all modes and would not affect traffic flow.
- **Draft Circulation Element Maps:** Two intersections of Highway 1 – Fairway and Coronado – need to be designated as having crossings on the maps in the draft Circulation Element.
- **Bridges and Culverts:** A GPAC member noted appreciation for the summary of the city’s bridges and their condition. A bridge on Frontage Road near Casa del Mar and culverts should be added to this general assessment.

Staff Responses: Staff provided background about a number of the topics discussed including the following:

- *Commuter Mode Share: Journey to work and school mode share are pertinent to the Circulation Element. This information is included in the Active Living section of the Healthy Community Element.*
- *Complete Streets: Staff advised that the intention for draft language about complete streets is to emphasize the need for context sensitivity. Engineering standards that are limited to one configuration (e.g. sidewalk, curb, and gutter as part of every right-of-way cross section) may not be appropriate in all parts of town. The draft language opens the possibility to expand the standards to accommodate neighborhood context, special features such as mature landscaping and trees, drainage, parking, and other matters, such as use of permeable and more natural materials for walkways.*
- *Parallel Vehicular Routes Consensus: Staff advised that it is premature to ask the GPAC to make a consensus statement on parallel vehicular routes because many alternatives were mentioned. Staff will provide a summary of them and maps for GPAC discussion at the next session.*

Plan Half Moon Bay
GPAC Meeting #14 Summary

- *SR 92 East of Town: Staff noted that Policy 3-I.47 generally addresses the City's advocacy role in working with other agencies to improve the operation and safety of SR 92 east of town. Staff noted that more specific language could be added to the policy to better express the GPAC's intent.*
- *Electric Vehicles and Greener Transportation: Staff identified that electric vehicles and greener transportation are addressed in the draft Circulation Element as well as in the Conservation and Open Space Element. In the Circulation Element, policies 3-I.10, .11, and .12 directly address green transportation, provision for green vehicles, and provision for green streets. It was also noted that these policies are relevant to autonomous vehicles.*
- *Street Typologies: Staff described an alternate approach to addressing multi modal performance standards. In this method, appropriate streets are assigned to emphasize alternate transportation modes such as bicycling or transit in an organized and interconnected fashion. The result is that future improvements to such identified streets would be designed to especially support the mode of its typology.*

Next Steps in the Process:

GPAC sessions are planned as follows:

- January 11, 2017, Wednesday: Noise Element, Healthy Community Element, Circulation Element (continued)
- January 26, 2017, Thursday: Tentative

Staff noted that they will return to City Council at an upcoming meeting, most likely in January, to conclude discussions and receive direction on topics presented at Council's November 15, 2016 session.

Attendance

GPAC Members

James Benjamin
Jo Chamberlain
Tom Conroy, Planning Commission Member
Hugh Doherty
Jan Gray
Greg Jamison
Cameron Jeffs
Diane Johnson
Ed Love (Alternate at Large)
Dan McMillan
Shahrzad Pantera, Parks and Recreation Committee Member
Sara Polgar

City Staff

Jill Ekas, Planning Manager
Bridget Jett, Planning Analyst