Meeting Agenda

- Review of Project Objectives
- Description of Changes in Project Scope and Schedule
- Consideration of an Alternative Forecast of Development Potential
- Consideration of Alternative Transportation Performance Standards
- Next Steps
Review of Project Objectives
What is Connect the Coastside?

The Plan will identify measures to ensure future residential and non-residential development can be supported by the future transportation system and infrastructure.
Project Objectives

- Estimate the buildout development potential of the Midcoast and Half Moon Bay as permitted by the LCP, General Plan, zoning and pertinent regulations
- Identify the potential impacts of growth on traffic, mobility and safety
- Identify and evaluate measures to minimize and mitigate the impacts of growth
- Develop a plan for funding and implementing transportation improvements
Description of Changes in Project Scope and Schedule
Changes resulted from community feedback received in Spring of 2015. The community wanted...

1. Analysis of a more reasonable level of development potential than the “Full Buildout”
2. Analysis of transportation needs and deficiencies based on multi-modal measures and standards – not just auto-oriented roadway measures
3. More context-sensitive solution options – transportation and land use options
4. More opportunities for community input
5. More time to review project material in advance of workshops and other public meetings
Workshop #1: Opportunities and Constraints - November 2014
Workshop #2: Alternatives - March 2015
Workshop #3: Alternative Development Forecast & Performance Standards - October 2015
Workshop #4: Revised Transportation Alternatives – March 2016
Workshop #5: Land Use Policy Concepts - April 2016
Workshop #6: Draft Plan - October 2016
Consideration of an Alternative Forecast of Development Potential
CTMP Study Area extends from Devils Slide to south end of Half Moon Bay and from I-280 to the Ocean.
Study Area

Half Moon Bay Subarea
Study Area

Princeton Subarea
Midcoast Subarea: Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada and Miramar
Study Area

Rural Lands Subarea
Consideration of an Alternative Forecast of Development Potential

Assessment of Potential Development in the Study Area

- 25-year forecast
- To be used as baseline for CTMP
- Alternative to “Full Buildout” analysis presented in Fall 2014
- Updated data and assumptions
Consideration of an Alternative Forecast of Development Potential

In generating Development Forecast we evaluated:

- Vacant and underutilized land
- Zoning
- Annual growth limits in Midcoast LCP and City of Half Moon Bay (Measure D)
- Water capacity identified in CCWD and MWSD plans
- Market study conducted for Half Moon Bay (2014)
- Development trends since 1990
- Regional growth projections for 2035
Constrained Development Potential Forecast would account for:
- Midcoast and Half Moon Bay Growth Control Measures
- Market Projections for Half Moon Bay

Potential water and sewer constraints could change over time

Development trends and regional projections provide good yardstick
Zoning-based Buildout Used as Starting Point

Where is future development likely to occur?
- Vacant Land
- Underutilized Commercial Land
- Residential Land on Large Parcels

Density and intensity assumptions based on typical existing development and what zoning allows

Current development projects were accounted for
Local Coastal Program (LCP) Consistency

Midcoast LCP
- Contiguously-Owned Substandard Parcels
- Density Credits in Rural Lands

Half Moon Bay LCP
- Development allowed in each Planned Unit Development (PUD) area, adjusted to account for conserved land
Constraints

Growth Control Constraints
- Midcoast LCP Policy 1.23: 40 units per year
- Half Moon Bay Measure D: 1% annual growth
- Zoning-based analysis is more limiting than Measure D in Half Moon Bay

Market Projections
- Uses Market Study conducted for Half Moon Bay General Plan Update (2014)
- Applies projected growth rates for residential and non-residential development in Half Moon Bay
## Constrained Forecast of Residential Development Potential

### Existing (2014) vs. Forecast Total (2040) (Percent Change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Multifamily</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Single-Family</th>
<th>Multifamily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Midcoast</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>4,005</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>5,416</td>
<td>4,740</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(26%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(129%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>4,481</td>
<td>3,493</td>
<td>988</td>
<td>5,335</td>
<td>4,106</td>
<td>1,229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(19%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8,781</td>
<td>7,498</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>10,750</td>
<td>8,590</td>
<td>1,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(22%)</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
<td>(48%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Constrained Forecast of Non-Residential Development Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subarea</th>
<th>Existing (2014)</th>
<th>Forecast New (Pipeline + Future)</th>
<th>Forecast Total (2040)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Non-Residential Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Midcoast</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>1,154,800</td>
<td>2,443</td>
<td>4,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Moon Bay</td>
<td>5,334</td>
<td>331,500</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>5,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7,885</td>
<td>1,486,300</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>10,698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Constrained Forecast of Development Potential

Constrained Residential Development Potential

- Housing Units
  - Unincorporated Midcoast
  - Half Moon Bay
  - Total

- Existing (2014)
- Pipeline
- Future (to 2040)
Constrained Forecast of Development Potential

Constrained Non-Residential Development Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unincorporated</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Midcoast</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Half Moon Bay</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Existing (2014)**
- **Pipeline**
- **Future (to 2040)**
Consideration of Alternative Transportation Performance Standards
Purpose of Transportation Performance Standards

To evaluate whether existing and planned transportation infrastructure and services are adequate to meet the expected travel demand from growth
Alternative Standards

现有的标准

- 以车辆为中心的
- 道路段 - 容量基线的LOS
- 信号交叉口 - 延时基线的LOS
- 未信号化交叉口 - 次要街道延时基线的LOS

- 没有为其他模式的性能标准
Alternative Standards

Recommendations

- LOS exemptions or modifications
  - Low minor-approach volumes
  - Segments that emphasize use of more than one mode
- Standards to ensure pedestrian and bicycle mobility, safety and comfort
- Standards to ensure sufficient transit service and parking
Alternative Standards - Vehicle

Roadway Segments
- Remove current capacity-based LOS standard
- Introduce Delay Index standard
  - Congested Travel Time vs Freeflow Travel Time

Intersections
- Signalized: Retain current LOS standard
- Unsignalized: Apply current LOS standard only if signal warrant is met
Alternative Standards - Ped

Walking Demand Score

- San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
- Used to identify areas with potential pedestrian demand
Pedestrian Environmental Quality Index (PEQI)

- Intersection Safety
- Traffic Volume
- Street Design/ Pedestrian Volume
- Land Use
- Perceived Comfort

0-20: Unsuitable
21-40: Poor Pedestrian conditions
41-60: Basic Pedestrian conditions
61-80: Reasonable Pedestrian conditions
81-100: Ideal Pedestrian conditions
Alternative Standards - Ped

Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking Demand Score¹</th>
<th>Pedestrian Conditions</th>
<th>Crossing Density (wait time &lt; 45 sec)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 20 (Low)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Bus Stops, Trail Heads, and Beach Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 (Medium)</td>
<td>PEQI &gt; 40 Basic Pedestrian Conditions</td>
<td>Every ¼ mile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 30 (High)</td>
<td>PEQI &gt; 60 Reasonable Pedestrian Conditions</td>
<td>Every ¼ mile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan
Alternative Standards - Bike

Bicycle Environmental Quality Index (BEQI)

- Intersection Safety
- Vehicle Traffic
- Street Design/Bicycle Volume
- Land Use
- Perceived Comfort

0-20: Unsuitable
21-40: Poor Bicycle conditions
41-60: Basic Bicycle conditions
61-80: Reasonable Bicycle conditions
81-100: Ideal Bicycle conditions
Recommendations

Segments along Highway 1

- Reasonable Bicycle Conditions (BEQI score > 60)

Bicycle Parking

- Beach access points, major trip generators, recreational facilities should have bicycle parking
- Bicycle parking should have average occupancy of no greater than 85% occupancy during weekend midday peak
Alternative Standards - Transit

Recommendations

- No more than 85% Standing-Capacity Utilization
- Revised Bus Stop Amenity Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum (daily) Ridership Required</th>
<th>Bus Stop with Bench</th>
<th>Bus Stop with Shelter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Standard used by Samtrans</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommended Standard</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendations**

- Weekend Midday Peak
- No more than 85% Capacity Utilization within ¼ mile
- Potential Mitigations include: Support for multimodal access, parking pricing, or additional parking
Next Steps

- Review of Community Input
- Presentation to San Mateo County Planning Commission – November 4
- Evaluation of Transportation Needs and Deficiencies with Alternative Forecast of Development Potential
- Development and Evaluation of Transportation and Land Use Strategies to Address Needs and Deficiencies
- Workshop #4 – March 2016