General Response to Comments on Connect the Coastside Final Administrative Draft (January 2021)

General Comment	Response
INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS	
[1] Marked pedestrian crossings - Add center median islands - Prioritize Gray Whale Beach, Medio Ave., 2nd St., and Surfer's Beach - Concerns about safety of Virginia Ave. crossing - Add bi-modal bridge from north end of Carlos St. to Montara Lighthouse - Add smart pedestrian crossings on Highway 1 at California Ave. and 2nd St.	CTC Project Pe1 already includes language addressing evaluation of additional infrastructure at marked pedestrian crossings, like medians islands: *"Additional infrastructure, such as raised medians per the Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Study, should be evaluated as part of future detailed design at the project-level."* CTC aims to implement one crossing in each community in the near-term. The Plan includes recommended crossings at: Gray Whale Cove, 2nd St., and two near Surfer's Beach, among others. The specific design of crossings and whether they will be warning only (i.e., user-activated, on demand vs. part of a system), is not specified in the Plan and will be determined as part of future design. Caltrans is in the process of addressing concerns at the existing Virginia Avenue crossing, including recommendations to add a rectangular rapid flashing beacon. This work has been noted in the revised final draft plan. CTC recommended project Pe1 includes a separated bicycle and pedestrian bridge at the north end of Carlos Street to connect to the California Coastal Trail.
[2] Underpasses v. at-grade v. overpasses for crossings - Trail underpasses at Medio Creek and at Gray Whale Cove, Furtado Lane - Study feasibility of underpass in central Moss Beach v. overpass at northern end	See "Response to Connect the Coastside Virtual Meeting Inquiries," response #12. Based on feedback, the Plan includes a recommendation for an overpass at north end of Carlos St in Moss Beach to connect the Parallel Trail and Coastal Trail.
[3] Bikeways - Airport St. needs - Class 2 lanes on Highway 1, acknowledge Caltrans project to include bike lanes as part of their State Highway Operation and Protection Program (SHOPP)	Pedestrian and bicycle safety concerns on Cypress Avenue west were highlighted by many stakeholders during CTC's engagement. Cypress Avenue also provides access to transit stops. Improving Cypress Avenue via project B2 Airport Street Bikeway and Princeton Connections (Cypress Ave. from Highway 1 to Airport St.: Class III Bike Route with pedestrian path on north side) remains in the Plan. Airport Street is included as a proposed bikeway (Project B2) and engaging in the necessary study for B2 is a 5-year priority per Table 34.

General Comment	Response
- Improve connections via Dardanelle Trail at Fitzgerald Marine Reserve instead of at Cypress Ave west, which is narrow, unsafe	For Class 2 bike lanes on Highway 1, the CTC project team added language to project B1: *"Caltrans has a State Highway Operation and Protection Program project (SHOPP EA# 0Q130) that will involve repaving certain sections of Highway on the Midcoast. The project will stripe Class 2 bike lanes were feasible with locations to be determined in subsequent project phases."*
[4] Gondola Add gondola that goes over the hills to San Bruno	Provision and management of a cable propelled transit (CPT) system – or gondola – would need to be taken on by a transit provider, like the San Mateo County Transit District (SMCTD). At this time, SMCTD does not have capacity to develop or manage a CPT system. Further, a CPT system would need to be evaluated in the context of the San Mateo County Local Coastal Program's Visual Resources component.
[5] Coastal Trail Include section north of the Montara Mountain trailhead up to the Lantos tunnel	Connect the Coastside includes a potential alignment of the California Coastal Trail (CCT) north of Montara and recommends a specific alignment south of 1st Street. CTC recommends prioritizing completion of the Coastal Trail sections that serve transportation needs, as opposed to trails that would be primarily recreational in nature.
[6] Highway 1 crossing at 1st Street - Clarify why recommended crossing is in the Plan - Preference for a crossing at 2nd St	Connect the Coastside does not prioritize recommended crossing locations in each community; 2nd St could be the first crossing implemented in this area after further review. The Plan recommends both the 1st St and 2nd St crossings due to the location of a public parking lots, parking alongside Highway 1 north of 1st Street on the east side to access the coast, and potential future accessible open space development led by State partners on the east side of Highway 1.
[7] Highway 1 Montara Westside Pedestrian Path - Add between 10th St. and Seacliff Ct. - Explore long-term opportunity for connecting westside ped path above the road cut from 4th to Montara State Beach	The CTC team added these as long-term opportunity additions to CCT alignment as part of project Pe3: *"A westside path along Highway 1 from 10th St to Seacliff Court and 4th St to Montara State Beach should be considered as an addition to the primary CCT alignment to provide access to scenic vistas, with appropriate crossing infrastructure and signage added."*
[8] Trail between 14th St. and 16th St. Develop near term improvements	This section is part of the development of the Multimodal Parallel Trail; seeking funding for design is part of the early implementation actions. The CTC team has highlighted community feedback about the need for pedestrian infrastructure between 14th and 16th Streets with Caltrans.
[9] 16th St. / Highway 1 Add comment that intersection design needs to accommodate long/heavy vehicles for Montara Water & Sanitary District	The CTC team added language to project R5 – 16th St Intersection Control, *"Final design will need to accommodate large, long, and heavy vehicles which regularly access Montara Water and Sanitary District facilities on the westside of Highway 1."*
[10] Highway 1 / Carlos St. north - No left turn from Carlos Street onto Highway 1 - Add median on Carlos Street to channel right turn traffic onto Highway 1	Project R9 – Carlos Street realignment to 16th Street will connect Carlos Street directly to 16th St and will address concerns highlighted here in the long-term.

General Comment	Response
- Add right turn acceleration lane onto Highway 1 - Clear vegetation on south-facing berm of Highway 1 to improve sight distance. - Shorten Highway 1 left turn lane approaches, north to Lighthouse and south to Carlos Street, to provide better separation from the left turn lane for 16th Street and eliminate "suicide arrows"	
[11] California Ave. Roundabout - Concern of dropping bike lanes at California St (desire for Dutch-style roundabout, which would keep bike lanes throughout the roundabout, and continuous bike lanes on Highway 1) - Detailed feedback on 10% design (e.g., need for signs)	California Ave. and Highway 1 is a constrained intersection due to the presence of endangered California red-legged frogs between Highway 1 and Carlos Street near California Avenue. The Dutch-style roundabout that includes protected bike lanes will likely take more right-of-way, which would be more likely to encroach on species habitat. However, these comments have been noted for consideration during future design phases. Other detailed feedback on the conceptual 10% designs included in Connect the Coastside have been documented for consideration during future design.
[12] California Ave. and Highway 1 - Widen approaches - Stripe acceleration lanes, and separate right/left-turn lanes	See below.
[13] Cypress Ave. and Highway 1 - Widen approaches - Stripe acceleration lanes, and separate right/left-turn lanes	Solutions, such as the ones proposed here (widened approaches, acceleration lanes, etc.) would be evaluated through the development of a Project Initiation Document (PID) in partnership with Caltrans. The development of a PID is a priority action per Table 34: Early Implementation Actions. The CTC team added language in Chapter 8 under "Moving a Project Toward Implementation": *"Through the development of a PID, the project team would evaluate the various options to address challenges; for example, whether the challenges at Cypress Avenue and Highway 1 could be overcome with turn lanes or if an intersection control is needed."*
[14] Coronado St. / Highway 1 - Add sidewalks to west side of Highway 1 to get to intersection - Convergence of Coastal and Parallel trails, improve interior roadway infrastructure	The CTC team added language on project Pe1 - *"Either sidewalk should be added on the westside of Highway 1 to connect the two crossings or a direct paved connection from the new southern crossing to the existing Coastal Trail."* Project Pe7, El Granada Safe Routes to School (SRTS), recommends pedestrian and bicycle improvements to the interior network for roads which will foster connection to the Parallel Trail; the Coastal Trail will connect the Parallel Trail at the improved Coronado St. crossing (project Pe1).
[15] Alameda Ave. in Miramar	Connecting the Alameda Ave. right-of-way as part of addressing Coastal Trail realignment is identified on p.152 in "Recommended Planning Studies" and "Planning for Sea Level Rise and

General Comment	Response
Pave Alameda Ave. right-of-way to Magellan Ave. to provide alternate connections and improve local circulation	Coastal Erosion" in Connect the Coastside. The CTC project team cannot engage in the requisite analysis or community engagement to vet this idea at this time. The CTC team added language in this same section under Highway 1 to note need to address local circulation impacts: *"Long-term realignment of Highway 1 may be necessary to comprehensively address sea level rise threats, including reassessing the local roadway network and its connections. For example, stakeholders identified circulation concerns in Miramar that could be exacerbated by coastal erosion and suggested paving and connecting Alameda Avenue."*
[16] Medio Ave. / Highway 1 - Need for increased infrastructure - Consider roundabout at this location	Connect the Coastside's Final Administrative Draft Plan (CTC or Plan) recommends a marked crosswalk with rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) or pedestrian hybrid beacon (PHB) at Medio Avenue and Highway 1 and to address additional infrastructure, such as median islands, as part of future detailed planning and design (see project Pe1). A signal warrant analysis would need to be completed to evaluate the appropriateness of an intersection control at this location. CTC's Appendix – Synchro Output – shows that under existing conditions, all movements at all time periods at Medio Ave. have less than 50 vehicles/hour; this is also true under projected buildout conditions. Therefore, the Plan does not currently recommend an intersection control at this location, in order to balance freeway traffic flow with side street movements.
[17] Highway 92 Add lanes for people to turn on/off for businesses where possible	CTC already recommends left-turn pockets/lanes at key locations on Highway 92 (project R14) -- *"Highway 92 at key activity generators such as: Half Moon Bay Nursery (11691 San Mateo Rd), Sun Studios Garden Center (12001 San Mateo Rd), Lemos Farm / Repetto's Florist (12320 San Mateo Rd), Pastorino Farms (513 San Mateo Rd), Repetto's (381 San Mateo Rd), and Spanish Town (276 San Mateo Rd)."* These will need further study for implementation as they will require grading, widening, fill, and other improvements.
PROGRAMMATIC / POLICY	
Recreational Shuttle - Extend to shuttle to Bayside to Bay Trail in Foster City, San Mateo, or Redwood Shores - Northern start at Lake Merced before BART would be helpful for bicycling community	The CTC team revised this project to be more expansive of service type to microtransit and references the need to engage in further study to increase connections for cyclists.
Near-term improvements - Add in near term solutions, then reassess need for longer-term options using new data, including assessment for intersections of Highway 1 with Cypress Avenue and California Avenue	The assessment of Highways 1 with Cypress Avenue and California Avenue will include other types of solutions, which is part of the Project Initiation Document (PID) development. At present, data analysis shows impacts at these locations under existing (Cypress Avenue) and buildout scenarios (California and Cypress Avenues), which is why Connect the Coastside recommends intersection controls. Engaging in the PID process will reassess the locations to see whether improvements are warranted now, and if so, to what degree.

General Comment	Response
Land Use Policy Implementation - Lot Merger and Lot Retirement - Sequential v. concurrent implementation - Maps of eligible parcels	Based on this request, the CTC team evaluated the feasibility of the lot merger program in depth, and determined that the Witt and Abernathy decisions, the 2017 update to County Subdivision Regulations, and the preferences of property owners are leading to the creation of legal parcels at or above today's minimum parcel size without the need for a mandatory lot merger program. See next response for Lot Retirement information.
Lot Retirement - Expand application to legal parcels near parklands, sensitive habitat, or buffer zones (e.g., Montecito Riparian Corridor) and high fire areas (El Granada Highlands) - Incentives for lot retirement from 2016 D&B report (like those in Cambria) - Update lot retirement data - Suggest that if any urban Midcoast residentially zoned property is up-zoned, lot retirement on a one-to-one basis should be required. - How does 1:1 lot retirement for subdivisions reduce buildout?	Upon further evaluation, the CTC team does not recommend a lot retirement requirement for subdivisions, as there are few potential subdivisions in the urban Midcoast and it would pose potential legal issues for the County. Staff reviewed subdivision applications submitted between 2010-2020 for properties in Montara, Moss Beach, Princeton, El Granada, and Miramar, and found only 3 approved subdivisions, which created a total of 4 additional parcels. In order to justify such a requirement, it would be necessary to find a connection between the impact of the project and the mitigation being required. In other words, the requirement to retire lot(s) must be based on the actual effect of the subdivision. The level of mitigation also needs to be proportional to project impacts. That is, the cost and benefit of lot retirement must be roughly equivalent to the degree of impact caused by a subdivision. It is unknown whether the lot retirement program would meet these tests if legally challenged. If the County were to implement a lot retirement requirement, it will bear the burden of defending any legal challenges to this policy. However, the County could further explore other options (such as a Transfer of Development Credits/Rights program) to decrease/disincentivize future development in high hazard or sensitive areas in future planning efforts such as the updates of the Safety Element and Housing Element.
Request for a subdivision moratorium	The CTC team does not recommend a subdivision moratorium, because a subdivision moratorium would present legal challenges while providing little impact, as few subdivisions take place in the urban Midcoast.
Maximum Buildout - Does it assume all land will be developed to full density it is zoned? - Impact of buildout on local infrastructure, since Local Coastal Program (LCP) states that both forecasts exceed current water and wastewater treatment capacity	The answer to the first question is explained on p.42 of the Final Draft: "*The development analysis also included assumptions to estimate:* *(1) the amount of existing development, for parcels for which this data was not included in the Assessor's data file, and* *(2) the amount and type of future development projected on "opportunity sites."* *Opportunity sites were identified for each subarea. Opportunity sites are parcels that are undeveloped or underutilized and which are likely to be developed in the future. Assumptions*

General Comment	Response
	followed those of the San Mateo County Midcoast LCP Update and the Plan Princeton effort, where relevant. ***Development assumptions for both residential and non-residential development were refined based on what is allowed by zoning, the typical density and intensity of existing development, and regulatory constraint factors***." Development Assumptions by Subarea can be found in Appendix B of the Buildout Analysis and Traffic Projections Final Report. Impact of buildout on local infrastructure: most of the improvements suggested in Connect the Coastside will improve existing conditions, as well as buildout conditions. New development on the Midcoast is permitted based on a number of factors, and access to water meters is one part of this equation.
Conservation lot purchase program - Hazard and Environmentally Sensitive Habitat Area (ESHA) lot purchase program for undeveloped lots located in very high fire severity zones, within path of sea level rise and within ESHA and/or ESHA buffers	While this kind of program is outside of the scope of Connect the Coastside, it could be explored in future planning efforts, such as part of the update of the County's Safety Element.
Include need to complete Linear Park & Trail Plan Overlay Specific Plan for Devil's Slide Bypass (LCP Policy 11.33)	LCP Policy 11.33 is focused on advancing and supporting recreational open space and trails as noted in the title of this LCP policy and specific plan and in area outside of the central Midcoast (see Map 1.4 of LCP). Connect the Coastside is focused on transportation and alternatives to single occupancy vehicle use, and specifically, avoiding vehicle trips along Highway 1. The area of the Linear Park and Trail Plan Overlay does not connect population centers and is unlikely to support mode shift.
Evacuation Plan and Hazard Plan to inform this final version - Include a chapter outlining evacuation plans for residents and visitors under current and buildout conditions, showing how Plan's improvements will enhance traffic flow and the ability to evacuate. - Analyze various disaster scenarios, such as a major seismic event on a weekend - Address wildfire evacuation concerns from the County's Hazard Mitigation Plan	Connect the Coastside is not an evacuation plan; it is a transportation plan that intends to improve traffic conditions for typical conditions. Connect the Coastside has provided additional information on emergency response and evacuation on p.167 of the Plan.

General Comment	Response
Acknowledge Highway 1 is limited to two (2) lanes in scenic areas – Montara Beach and south of Half Moon Bay (HMB)	LCP Policy 2.42 Capacity Limits (d.) states: "maintain Highway 1 as a scenic two-lane road outside the Urban Midcoast area as depicted on Land Use Plan Map 1.3." The extents of Map 1.3 are from 1st St. in El Granada to Half Moon Bay (HMB) border. The CTC team added a reference to this LCP policy under Chapter 5, "Proposed performance standards," "Roadway Performance Standard" (p.62)
Use level of service (LOS) as primary performance standard; use delay as an additional standard	Level of Service (LOS) will continue to be a metric used to understand traffic impacts, as it will be part of the County's Traffic Impact Analysis Requirements and C/CAG's Congestion Management Program. The recommendation to use the delay index is specific to capacity limit measurements in the context of roadway expansion (LCP Policy 2.43). If the LCP were amended to include this standard, there would be additional ways to mitigate for impacts. With roadway LOS, the only solution for impacts is roadway expansion, and roadway expansion would induce vehicle miles traveled, which would in turn have a significant impact under the California Environmental Quality Act, working against broader local, regional, and state goals.
Delay Index change - Change from 2.0 to 3.0 where bike lanes exist seems inappropriate	Implementing the Multimodal Parallel Trail is a near-term priority; however, there may be areas where a Class 1 facility is not feasible due to unforeseen constraints. The intent of this standard is to provide flexibility in mitigation opportunities where a higher standard would be acceptable.
Traffic control measures for peak weekend and special events to reduce congestion - LCP policy addressing measures to reduce congestion and control traffic, including traffic control personnel in congested locations on Highways 1 and 92 during peak weekend use and for special events	The CTC team added a recommended program "Traffic Control Measures": *"Connect the Coastside recommends the Planning and Building Department engage partners, including the cities of Pacifica and Half Moon Bay, to develop a coordinated approach to traffic control for uses and events that generate large traffic volumes."*
Parking - Study to better guide parking, including all designated parking lots - Miramar needs parking off Magellan Ave. near trailhead at Mirada Surf	The CTC team added language in existing conditions Parking section (p.69) *"Stakeholders also noted the need for additional parking in Miramar, and specifically, on Magellan Avenue at the trailhead at Mirada Surf."* The Plan already includes a recommendation for a future Parking Study for all communities.
IMPLEMENTATION	
Cost - Unclear how the plan will be paid for - Assumptions behind total cost - Assess full costs for all major components of improvement options (e.g., grading, land acquisition, watershed, etc.)	The CTC team added a clause in "Overview" section of Chapter 8, *"Implementation of Connect the Coastside will require strong partnerships with actors like Caltrans, other agencies, and ongoing support from the community to work together to find common ground on detailed project designs and funding mechanisms, such as pursuing competitive grants or using existing resources."*

General Comment	Response
- Clarify who will pay for things and utility impacts - Concern for costs to residents, particularly if utilities need to be repaired after major road work. Request for stipulation that states hidden costs will be covered by projects.	Connect the Coastside is a conceptual plan and is not the appropriate avenue to assess detailed project-level costs; it includes general estimates to guide planning. The CTC project team added language in "Planning-level cost estimates" Chapter 8: *"Cost estimates presented are planning-level and conceptual, using unit costs for key construction items, lump sums for environmental engineering, right-of-way acquisition, and utility coordination, and have additional contingency amounts added based on a percentage of total construction costs. As projects undergo further planning as part of the implementation process, assumptions will be revisited and revised which will affect costs. For example, any utility impact costs, such as relocation, will be evaluated in detail in future phases of project design and incorporated into the project cost."* The Connect the Coastside project team found errors in the summary table of the January 2020 draft's cost estimate table that included a double counting of some projects. The cost estimates of the January 2021 draft were further refined and re-summed.
Timeline - How optimistic is the timeline? - Assumptions	The project implementation timeline (Table 33) and early implementation actions (Table 34) are optimistic. The key considerations that influence the timeline are included in Chapter 8, Implementation under "Next Steps". General assumptions included at least 1 full time equivalent in the Planning and Building Department to support implementation, and willingness from key partners (for example, Caltrans, SamTrans, and others) to engage with Planning and Building staff and work collaboratively to identify opportunities for implementation with their respective agencies. Although Planning & Building staff have led the development of Connect the Coastside, this department is not in charge of County resources nor infrastructure decisions, so can largely act in a leadership and convening role only.
Prioritize completion of entire Parallel Trail	CTC Project team revised Table 34: Early Implementation Actions to reflect this – *"Complete project implementation for Phase 1 of the trail. Seek funding to begin and complete the detailed planning and design process for the rest of the Multimodal Parallel Trail (from El Granada to Montara)."*
Impacts on buildout vs. accessibility - How will CTC implementation affect the timing of development projects to preserve safety and visitor accessibility? - What will be required before specific projects can proceed? - Cumulative impact of approved new developments on Highway 1	Certain projects will be required to engage in traffic impact analysis per County Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines (https://publicworks.smcgov.org/documents/traffic-impact-analysis-requirements) and develop a traffic impact mitigation plan, per LCP Policy 2.52. Both call for analysis of cumulative traffic impacts. Elements of a traffic impact mitigation plan could further implementation of Connect the Coastside and be included as part of the project's conditions of approval. In general, the LCP's policies intend to preserve safety and visitor accessibility and all projects are reviewed as such. Connect the Coastside's purpose is to look at cumulative impact of development at LCP Buildout and the recommended projects are to mitigate for those collective impacts. Specific development projects may have localized impacts and/or improvements that are not captured in CTC and vice versa. The traffic impact analysis and/or traffic impact mitigation plan would highlight impacts and identify potential mitigations.

General Comment	Response
Regular Midcoast Transportation Review - Highway data monitoring plans - Annual update with key data	CTC Project Team revised Table 34 to: *"Leverage County's existing web and data infrastructure to make existing and future transportation and development data publicly available, for the purpose of informing annual status reports on Connect the Coastside, including informational presentation to Midcoast Community Council."*
DATA	
Transportation impacts due to visitors/non-residents	Connect the Coastside is intended to address LCP Policy 2.53 Transportation Management Plan, which is to address the cumulative traffic impacts of residential development. The Plan does not provide specific data on visitor-related traffic but does reference the impact of visitors more generally on travel conditions. Visitor traffic is an important consideration for the development of the recommendations and is incorporated into the analysis as part of weekend peak period traffic counts. The Plans' recommendations intend to mitigate for vehicle trips due to both residents and visitors with a focus on modal shift.
Roundabout efficacy/impacts - Modeling pre/post roundabout traffic flows (balanced traffic v. high volumes on Highway 1)	Further analysis would be completed as part of future project phases (such as the Project Initiation phase) as described in Chapter 8.
At-grade pedestrian crossings - Impacts on traffic flow	The traffic analysis software used for Connect the Coastside can model operational improvements only; meaning interventions such as traffic signals, turn lanes, acceleration lanes, and signal timing changes. The requested analysis would be done as part of future project phases, as described in Chapter 8.
Delay Index - Assumptions for why bicycle lanes, pedestrian improvements, trails would diminish traffic to point of improving delay index on Highway 1? What traffic will diminish? - Compare LOS, Delay, and traffic flow	The Plan posits that with high quality alternatives to single occupancy vehicles (e.g., paths, frequent transit, etc.), more people are likely to choose walking, bicycling, or transit over driving for trips. The use of the delay index is to increase the types of mitigation options available. The primary reason the delay index and level of service (LOS) improves under the mitigated buildout scenario is due to operational improvements (turn lanes at intersections, intersection controls, and signal timing), not providing bike lanes. Level of service and delay are different measurements and cannot be readily compared; the pre/post intersection LOS and delay index inclusive of interventions is already provided in the Plan.
Update and correct data - Provide more recent data - Current buildout projections for Midcoast and Half Moon Bay	New data collection is out of the scope of this project. Staff compared newer counts with 2014 data collected at certain locations and found commensurate values: this table is in the Appendices. New data will be collected by project sponsors at the time of project development. Chapter 4 of Connect the Coastside provides detail on the various projections used, including the Half Moon Bay Local Land Use Plan Update and HMB's buildout projections. The summary table of the delay index in the January 2020 draft included incorrect summations; the base data analysis and outputs did not change: the Appendices output of Synchro and

General Comment	Response
	Simtraffic data are the same. The project team caught errors in the January 2020 draft excel tables that summarized the final calculations and corrected this for the January 2021 Final Administrative draft. For example, in Table 16 of the January 2020 draft, the AM peak hour travel time is listed as 43 m and 44 sec (or 2,624 sec), and free flow travel time is 8 m 42 sec (or 522 sec). The delay index = peak period travel time / free flow travel time, so 2,624 / 522 = 5.02. But the delay index listed in the table is 18.82.
Add LOS on Highways 1 and 92 within HMB limits - Data from the HMB LUP Public Review Draft July 2019, specifically Table 3-9 Highway 1 and 92 Performance and Figure 3-3 Circulation System Performance, pages 3-38 and 3-39, which show existing (2018) LOS at PM Peak Hour on Highway 1 North of 92 as "F" and on Highway 92 within the City Limits as "E".	The CTC project team added a reference to Half Moon Bay's Local Coastal Land Use Plan (LCLUP) in Existing Roadway LOS section of Chapter 5: *"The City of Half Moon Bay's Local Coastal Land Use Plan's Table B-10 includes Highways 1 and 92 Roadway Level of Service for 2018 on page B-9: roadway LOS is F for Highway 1 north of Highway 92, D for Highway 1 south of Highway 92, and E for Highway 92 for the AM, PM, and weekend peak periods."* Similarly, the Project Team references HMB LCLUP in Existing Delay Index: *"For the weekday AM period, the delay index is 3.1 for Highway 1 north of Highway 92, 1.01 for Highway 1 south of Highway 92, and 1.3 for Highway 92. For the Weekday PM period, the delay index is 2.9 for Highway 1 north of Highway 92, 1.01 for Highway 1 south of Highway 92, and 1.8 for Highway 92."* Similarly, the Project Team references to HMB LCLUP Maximum Theoretical Buildout under projected deficiencies: *"The City of Half Moon Bay's Local Coastal Land Use Plan's Table B-10 includes Highways 1 and 92 Roadway Level of Service for maximum theoretical buildout on page B-9: roadway LOS is F for Highway 1 north of Highway 92, D or E for Highway 1 south of Highway 92, and F for Highway 92 for the AM, PM, and weekend peak periods."* Similarly, the Project Team references to HMB LCLUP MTB delay under projected deficiencies: *"The City of Half Moon Bay's Local Coastal Land Use Plan's Table B-10 includes Highways 1 and 92 delay index values for maximum theoretical buildout on page B-9.[1] For the weekday AM period, the delay index is 5.1 for Highway 1 north of Highway 92, 1.03 for Highway 1 south of Highway 92, and 2.3 for Highway 92. For the Weekday PM period, the delay index is 5.7 for Highway 1 north of Highway 92, 1.03 for Highway 1 south of Highway 92, and 3.9 for Highway 92."* [1] City of Half Moon Bay Local Coastal Land Use Plan, Updated 2020. https://www.half-moon-bay.ca.us/154/Local-Coastal-Program-Land-Use-Plan
Midcoast permit numbers	The Final Administrative Draft includes the number of new residential units constructed and finalized in the study area between 2015-2020, to augment the 2014 numbers for existing

General Comment	Response
- Review number of building permits issued for accuracy	housing units. The number of constructed and finalized units differs from building permits issued because these are two different measurements.
Demographics - Use most recent Census data	The most recent granular data available is through the 2019 American Community Survey, which is what is included in Connect the Coastside.
COORDINATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES	
Concerns in Half Moon Bay - Signal synchronization. Highway 1 / 92 could be green northbound and light at Main / Highway 1 is red – leads to bottleneck for those turning on Highway 1 from 92, Strawflower Village, or Main	CTC team alerted Half Moon Bay staff to this concern.
Coordination with Half Moon Bay (HMB) - How two separate processes result in overall solution for Midcoast - What happens if HMB and the County don't agree on a solution/vision?	CTC project team added a section in Chapter 8. Implementation called "ADVANCING IMPLEMENTATION THROUGH COORDINATION AND PARTNERSHIPS" that describes this further. In short, Half Moon Bay (HMB) and County staff have met regularly throughout the development of CTC, with HMB staff serving on the County's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). HMB's vision for Highway 1 is outlined in their approved LCLUP, recently adopted bike/ped plan, and their Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Their vision is one of multimodality and collaborating with Caltrans to arrive at solutions that preserve the character of the coastside, which are goals shared by Connect the Coastside.
Caltrans coordination	Like above, the CTC project team added a section in Chapter 8. Implementation which describes this further. In short, Caltrans staff has participated on CTC's Technical Advisory Committee and reviewed the Final Administrative Draft. Caltrans and the County coordinate and engage through the permitting process and meet quarterly to advance shared project goals.
Montara Water and Sanitary District (MWSD) - Engagement and impacts on high pressure water/sewer pipes	Like above, the CTC project team added a section in Chapter 8. Implementation which describes coordination with utilities further. In short, the CTC project team provided a presentation to the MWSD Board about the Plan and has been in communication with staff about the high-pressure pipes. The CTC project team has called this consideration out as part of the new section, future cost estimates, and at the individual project level.
School Coordination - School trips impact peak commute traffic; need school buses - Cabrillo Unified School District (CUSD) enrollment numbers falling	Trips to school can contribute to congestion, as outlined in the Transit section of Chapter 6. Cabrillo Unified School District (CUSD) used to provide school bus services to students traveling to Farallone View Elementary School; however, they removed that service due to low ridership and because the "choice" school provision was changed to allow for more students to go to their neighborhood school (i.e., in walk/bike distance of home). Secondly, the district's anticipated enrollment is declining by over 300 students over the next 3 years. The demand for school buses has already gone down and will continue to diminish. Connect the Coastside is focused on supporting trips to school by walking and bicycling since most students live close to their school.

General Comment	Response
Coastal Commission Certification	The County does not intend to amend the LCP Policy 1.23 which includes a 40 unit/year cap and is not pursuing California Coastal Commission (CCC) certification of the Plan because the Plan itself is not an LCP amendment. The County met with CCC staff in March 2021 to discuss the Plan and shared the Final Administrative Draft for feedback. The County shared the Final Draft with the CCC. Individual LCP amendments stemming from implementation of Connect the Coastside will be brought to the CCC for consideration.
SamTrans - SamTrans commitment to improvements in bus service - Does CTC rely on funding within SamTrans budget?	CTC is a plan and funding for implementation of its recommendations will need to be identified. The CTC project team has shared the Plan with SamTrans staff and worked with SamTrans staff to develop the cost estimates for transit-related projects. CTC is a long-range plan and assumes project implementation will take place over a 30-year time frame; it does not identify where funding will come from on a per-project basis. County staff will continue to engage with SamTrans staff to implement transit recommendations over time. SamTrans is currently leading its own service planning effort (Reimagine SamTrans) to inform service changes, inclusive of coastside service.
Commute.org - Opportunity to expand on potential coordination	The CTC project team included a new section that highlights Commute.org called “Incentives for Sustainable Transportation” in Chapter 7. Recommendations, under other supportive efforts. Midcoast stakeholders can take advantage of the various Commute.org programs today and the County is already working with Commute.org as part of the City/County Association of Governments of San Mateo County (C/CAG) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Policy.