



Measure A Highway Program Call for Projects First Cycle: May 24 2012

Instructions for Full and Simplified Application Forms

All materials are available online at: http://www.smcta.com/highway_program.html

Questions? Contact **Celia Chung** 650-508-6466 <chungc@samtrans.com>

This application is designed to provide the evaluators with both the technical and contextual information to evaluate project applications and make funding recommendations for the current cycle.

Applications are due on June 29, 2012 at 4 p.m.

- Email to callforprojects@samtrans.com
- Hard copies are also acceptable. Submit **six** sets to:
San Mateo County Transportation Authority
Attn: Celia Chung
1250 San Carlos Avenue
P.O. Box 3006
San Carlos, CA 94070

1. **Definitions:** The following terms are used throughout the application form. Please note when questions are specific to the overall project or the project scope, and respond accordingly.

- a. Overall project: The entire project ultimately to be constructed.
- b. Project scope: The specific project phases or elements for which Measure A funds are being requested in this application/cycle. The project scope may be a subset of the overall project.
- c. Sponsor Agency: The applicant for Measure A funds for the project scope.
- d. Implementing Agency: The agency implementing the project scope.

2. **Mandatory consultation with the TA:**

Applicants must consult with the TA before submitting applications if they are requesting the TA to be the implementing agency for the project (either as the lead implementer or to support implementation.)

3. Applicants may consult the TA for the following during the application process:

- a. Requests for technical assistance or data for completing the application forms. To expedite the processing of data requests, please be as specific as possible. Requests for data should be sent to hernandez@samtrans.com. The TA will provide requested data in electronic formats.

- b. Requests for multi-agency coordination. The TA can help with stakeholder coordination for project scopes which involve multiple agencies.
 - c. Information on prior Measure A funding allocations.
 - d. Clarifications for proposed projects if those are different from the project description of listed candidates.
4. Signatures for application submittal: The signature(s) of the contact person(s) for the sponsor agency (and the implementing agency) are required to confirm to the TA the person(s) responsible for the application being submitted.
5. Supplemental Questions (Section I)
- a. All applicants must complete I.1 – I.3.
 - b. Only applications which include preliminary planning and/or Project Initiation Document (PID) phases in the project scope must complete questions I.4 – I.6.
 - c. Only applications which include environmental phases must complete questions I.7 – I.8.
6. If the performance projections data for *Section C: Effectiveness* do not exist, the answer may be left blank. Applicants are not expected to make a special effort to collect data for this application. For KCA and SR candidate projects, please contact the TA, which may have available data.
7. Please contact the TA if you have questions while completing the application form. This will save time and follow-up efforts with applicants for the TA during the evaluation process. Applicants may request TA staff to review working drafts of applications before the application due date.
8. Please keep responses as clear and concise as possible.
9. Responses do not need to be repeated if the same response applies to different questions. Applicants may put “See response to prior question X.”



Measure A Highway Program Call for Projects First Cycle: May 24 2012

PROJECT APPLICATION FORM

Applicant Information

Sponsor Agency (Applicant):	San Mateo County (SMC)
Contact person:	Nicholas Calderon
Title:	Legislative Aide
Email:	ncalderon@co.sanmateo.ca.us
Phone number:	650-599-1016

N. J. Calderon

(Signature of Sponsor contact responsible for this application)

Implementing Agency:	SMC Transportation Authority
Contact person:	Joe Hurley
Title:	Program Director
Email:	Hurleyj@samtrans.com
Phone number:	(650) 508-7942

Joe M. Hurley

(Signature of Implementing Agency contact)

Overall Project Title:	Highway 1 Congestion, Throughput, and Safety Improvements Project
In Jurisdiction(s):	San Mateo County
Total Measure A Request for Project Scope:	\$1,500,000
Phases for Project Scope: <i>Check all applicable phases requesting Measure A funds</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary planning* <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PS&E <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PID <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ROW <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental <input type="checkbox"/> Construction <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please specify): _____

*feasibility studies, alternatives analyses, etc

Email to callforprojects@samtrans.com by June 29, 2012 4:00 PM

DEFINITIONS

- Sponsor Agency:* The applicant for Measure A funds for the project scope.
- Implementing Agency:* The agency implementing the project scope
- Overall Project:* The entire project ultimately to be constructed.
- Project Scope:* The specific project phases or elements for which Measure A funds are being requested in this application/cycle. The project scope may be a subset of the overall project.

For evaluator use only:

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Original Measure A
<input type="checkbox"/> New Measure A- SR (listed candidate) | <input type="checkbox"/> New Measure A - KCA
<input type="checkbox"/> New Measure A- SR (unlisted candidate) |
|--|---|

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Applicant Material and Information

- A. Attachments
- B. Overview

II. Application

- A. Readiness
 - B. Need
 - C. Effectiveness
 - D. Policy Consistency
 - E. Sustainability
 - F. Funding and Budget (Cost Effectiveness)
 - G. Ease of Implementation
 - H. Economies of Scale
 - I. Supplemental Questions
-

I. Applicant Material and Information

A. **Attachments:** Check the attachments which are included:

- Location Maps/Schematic Plans
- Sponsor Governing Board Resolution
Date: June 26, 2012 (*before July 27, 2012*)
- Non-Supplantation of Funds Certificate
- Letters of Support

(List any additional attachments)

- Letters showing community input, newspaper articles

B. **Overview**

1. Overall Project Description- Describe the overall project (the entire project ultimately to be constructed).

The San Mateo County Department of Planning and Building, with strong support from the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors and Midcoast Community Council, is applying for Measure A funds to make operational improvements along a 7 mile stretch of Highway 1 on the San Mateo County unincorporated Midcoast. The southernmost project, a pedestrian crossing, will be located at Mirada Road in Miramar while the northernmost project, a pedestrian crossing and left turn lane, will be located at Gray Whale between Montara and Devil's Slide. The overall project will result in the construction of project elements identified and prioritized in the County's "Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study: Phases 1 and 2." These studies, which represent a collaborative effort by consultants, county staff, CalTrans, the National Park Service, Midcoast Community Council and the public, will serve as the foundation for the overall project. Each project element is in alignment with goals and recommendations resulting from the study process, including community consensus of the most appropriate ways to enhance safety and relieve congestion in the area.

The Midcoast is comprised of five unincorporated communities, each with its own unique character - Montara, Moss Beach, El Granada, Princeton, and Miramar – all arranged in a long, narrow configuration between the ocean and coastal hills. The topography is varied and unique, including sandy beaches, dunes, ocean bluffs, flat coastal plain, creeks, canyons, marine ecosystem and hills. The area is geographically isolated by the Coast Range and Devil's Slide; residents feel a strong sense of community which is reinforced by this relative isolation as well as the fact that the Midcoast has remained a valued environment by coastal residents and visitors.

Highway 1 is the main arterial road traveling along the coast, offering the 15,000 Midcoast residents and numerous visitors one lane in and out of the scenic communities. Generally, recreation destinations and attractions lie on the west side of the highway and residential on the east. Conditions along the route vary from rural, undeveloped surroundings, where traffic movement is typically free, to the village areas where the highway becomes the de facto main street, with cross traffic, parking, and severe congestion during school and work commute times. There are periods of gridlock on weekends with good weather and during special events, leaving local residents feeling trapped and unable to efficiently access amenities in their own community. Visitors park in designated lots and informally along the highway shoulder at points for trail and beach access. Pedestrians and bicyclists are prevalent in the towns and at locations with access to beaches, surfing, hiking and trail-biking routes, often crossing the highway wherever there may be a break in traffic due to limited designated crossings.

In addition to heavy vehicle and pedestrian/bicycle use of Highway 1, there are two public bus routes that utilize the highway on the Midcoast. SamTrans Route 294 runs from Pacifica to the San Mateo CalTrain station and Route 17 is the Coast Shuttle, which provides service between the Midcoast and Half Moon Bay. The highway also supports freight movement.

The County's top priority for Highway 1 on the Midcoast is safety followed by congestion management. Consistent with this priority, the overall project intends to improve safety and decrease congestion in the area. The project will result in the construction of the elements described below at strategic locations on Highway 1. These elements were prioritized during the "Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study", which was developed by the County, with significant input from the Midcoast communities.

- Clearly marked, safe crossings for pedestrians and bicyclists. High speed and large traffic volumes bisect the Midcoast communities with few safe points for pedestrians to cross the highway. In the *Midcoast Recreation Needs Assessment*, seven potential highway crossings are identified, but only one has been implemented to date, at Coronado in El Granada.

Pedestrians often spontaneously dart out and cross Highway 1 at random locations, creating hazardous situations. New crossings provided at strategic locations will reduce the likelihood of dangerous foot traffic and facilitate predictable movements. With a vast majority of housing and parking on the Midcoast east of Highway 1 and attractions like county, state, and national beaches and hiking trails, a marine sanctuary and restaurants on the west side, the limited designated crossings that currently exist do not meet the demands.

Crossings would be most beneficial at Gray Whale Cove, Montara, Moss Beach, the Half Moon Bay Airport, Surfer's Beach and Miramar. The crossing at Gray Whale Cove will be on Highway 1 connecting Gray Whale Cove state beach on the west side of the highway and the parking lot on the east side. As one of the few designated parking lots in the area, this is a popular location for visitors to park before enjoying attractions on the west side of the highway. In Montara, crossings would be most beneficial at 2nd Street and 7th Street. Moss Beach would be best served with crossings at Highway 1 and California Ave, Virginia Ave, and Cypress Ave. This would allow residents from the east side of the highway to safely access popular attractions like the Fitzgerald Marine Reserve, restaurants, and trails on the west side of the highway. At the Half Moon Bay Airport, the crossing would best serve the residents at Capistrano Road North. The conceptual location of the crossing at Surfer's Beach can be viewed in Attachment 1f. It is possible the location will move upon further public process and technical analysis. Lastly, Miramar would be best served by a crossing at Highway 1 and Mirada Road. A conceptual drawing for crossings at Gray Whale Cove, Montara, Moss Beach, and Surfers Beach can be viewed in the attachment section. No conceptual drawing for a crossing at Mirada Road or the Half Moon Bay Airport has been designed. Upon completion of further public process and technical analysis, a conceptual design will be created. (see Attachments 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e, 1f).

- Left turns. With only one northbound and one southbound lane, Highway 1 offers few opportunities for vehicles to safely turn left. Further, while a vehicle waits for a safe opportunity to turn, those behind have two options: wait for the car in front to turn, which creates bottlenecks throughout the most traveled and popular locations on the Midcoast, or drive around the vehicle trying to turn, creating another safety hazard by entering onto the shoulder of the road where cars are parked and pedestrians/bicyclists abound. Constructing left turn pockets will allow traffic on the Midcoast to flow more freely while reducing hazards on the roadway. These left turns would provide maximum effectiveness in improving traffic flow if implemented at Gray Whale Cove and Montara. Both Gray Whale Cove and 8th Street in Montara would benefit from a painted "bird shaped" island with two left turn lane pockets. The left turn lane at Gray Whale Cove will be located just north of the parking lot on the east side of the highway to serve people driving south through the new Devil's Slide tunnel and those leaving the parking lot traveling south. In Montara, the left turn lane would be best serving at 8th Street turning east off of Highway 1 and south onto the Highway. The left turn lanes can be viewed in the conceptual designs in the attachment section (see Attachments 1b,1d,).
- Raised medians. Raised medians will physically restrict and channel turning movements, improve local circulation, encourage reduced speeds, and providing turning bays for vehicles to safely wait to turn. They will also provide "safe refuges" for pedestrians/bicyclists when crossing the highway. All safe crossings will be connected to medians for this purpose. These medians would best serve the communities at strategic locations in Montara, Moss Beach, and El Granada/Surfer's Beach. In Montara, the raised medians will best serve vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclist if they start just north of 1st Street and continue south past the Montara State Park parking lot with strategic breaks for traffic flow. In Montara, medians will also be placed just north of 7th Street and continue south to just north of 11th Street with strategic breaks for traffic flow.

In Moss Beach, the raised median would be best serving if they started north of Etheldore Street and ended south of Marine Boulevard with strategic breaks for traffic flow. At Surfer's Beach, the location and future of raised medians has not yet been determined. This will be vetted through further public process. The proposed raised medians in Montara and Moss Beach can be seen in the conceptual drawings in the attachment section (see Attachments 1c, 1d, 1e).

2. Project Scope (Phases Requesting Measure A Funds)- Describe the work to be done with the requested Measure A funds.

This application requests funds to move the Highway 1 Congestion, Throughput, and Safety Improvements Project up to the point of construction. The project scope includes:

- Completion of the required environmental studies (CEQA)
- Preliminary planning to refine design of crossings, left turn lanes and medians (for example, further community input meetings and technical analysis is needed before moving to design regarding the crossings at Mirada Road in Miramar and Surfer's Beach)
- Development of the Project Initiation Document
- An engineered design for each project component
- Confirming with CalTrans that project elements can be constructed within the existing right of way; acquire ROW from CalTrans (if needed)

3. Map - Provide/Attach a map of the project scope location.

Please see Attachment 1a.

II. Application

A. READINESS

1. Project Schedule- Provide the schedule information for the project scope. [Optional: provide any known schedule information for subsequent phases of the overall project.]

Project Phases	Start Date (Month/Year)	Completion Date (Month/Year)	Total Duration (#Months)	Status (e.g. Completed, In Progress)	Notes:
Preliminary Planning (e.g. Alternatives Analysis, Feasibility Study)	01/2013	09/2013	9 months	Not started.	The time line is based on Grant award by 01/2013. A delay in grant award will alter the schedule.
Project Initiation Document (PID)	09/2013	03/2014	6 months	Not started.	
Environmental (PA & ED)	01/2014	06/2014	6 months	Not started.	
Design (PS&E)	01/2013	03/2014	15 months	Not started.	
ROW Acquisition/ Certification	01/2014	06/2014	6 months	Not started.	
Construction					Not part of this grant.

2. Overall Project Activity To Date - Provide a narrative summary of the overall project activity to date. Include a discussion on the following key points:

- What work has been completed, and what work is in progress?

To date, there are conceptual designs of all proposed projects contained in the community-approved “Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study” with the exception of the crossing at Mirada Road in Miramar. In 2009, San Mateo County received funding from CalTrans to study how to improve safety and mobility on Highway 1 throughout the Midcoast. This study consisted of two phases. Phase 1 studied El Granada, Miramar, Princeton, and Pillar Point and was completed in 2010. Phase 2, completed in 2011, covered the Midcoast north of the Half Moon Bay Airport to Montara.

- What deliverables have been produced? *(Include online links to documents, or include electronic copies if the documents are not available online.)*

Both phases of the Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study have been completed. The purpose of the two-phased study was to develop potential safety and mobility solutions for Highway 1 to better serve all users. Planning efforts by San Mateo County, the Midcoast Community Council and other agencies are shaping development, recreation, infrastructure, and environmental policies within the study area. A community-based planning process was used to engage residents and stakeholders in developing transportation improvement strategies consistent with existing and pending regional policies. The study documents contain conceptual plans for this project.

Relevant links are as follows:

Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study Phase 1:

http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/Attachments/planning/PDFs/Midcoast%20Mobility/Highway%201%20Safety%20and%20Mobility%20Improvement%20Study_Phase1.pdf

Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study Phase 2:

<http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/Attachments/planning/PDFs/Midcoast%20Mobility/Draft%20SMM%20Ph%202%20Study%20v5%20Low%20Res.pdf>

Information about the study process, outreach flyers in English and Spanish, etc.:

<http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/portal/site/planning/menuitem.2ca7e1985b6c8f5565d293e5d17332a0/?vgnextoid=c16e7c06c7abe210VgnVCM1000001937230aRCRD&vgnnextchannel=a29e7c06c7abe210VgnVCM1000001937230aRCRD&vgnnextfmt=default>

- Which agencies were/are involved with the project, and what were/are their respective roles?

The San Mateo County Department of Planning and Building is the lead entity and sponsor for this project, coordinating and overseeing each phase to completion. The department has reviewed and authorized the submittal of this application to the Transportation Authority (TA). The county, along with the TA, will be implementing the project. The county has discussed and cleared this partnership with Joe Hurley, Project Manager, of the TA. The TA will work on design, engineering and ensuring conformance with CalTrans policy. Caltrans, as the owner of the highway, will be involved in approving each phase.

Each entity, as well as Midcoast-specific entities, has a desire to improve Highway 1 and the proposed project scope is an important step toward this goal. Two projects, one recently completed and the other in progress, further demonstrate the motivation to make operational improvements in the Midcoast area:

- CalTrans is currently installing three left turn lanes in Montara: one is at Highway 1 westbound onto 16th street, the second is at the same location, but eastbound and the third is on Highway 1 at Carlos Street going east. These projects, which are located inside the 7 mile stretch of highway our projects would impact, make similar improvements to ours. Please see Attachment 1g for CalTrans' engineered design.
 - The City of Half Moon Bay recently constructed medians on a 1.5 mile length of Highway 1 through the downtown area (Kehoe Ave. to Main St.) with strategic breaks for traffic flow.
3. If the project scope will NOT be completed in 3 years, explain why.

The project scope is designed to be completed within 18 months.

4. If this request for Measure A funds is partially granted, how will the project scope be changed, funded, and/or implemented?

The budget takes into consideration all required elements to bring the project to construction. Without these funds, the project would face a challenge. We understand, however, that we may not receive the full amount and have prioritized the project elements¹. If Measure A funds were partially granted, the lower priority elements in the scope would be phased in over time as further funds are secured.

¹Please note, “elements” refer to the pedestrian crossings, left turn lanes and medians

B. NEED

1. By reference to the Countywide Transportation Plan 2010 (C/CAG, January 2001), in which priority corridor is the overall project located?

Very High Priority: Northern 101

High Priority: Northern 280

Southern 101

Eastern 92

Northern 1 (Pacifica to Devil's Slide)

2. What are the technical and policy issues driving the need for the overall project? (Why is the project needed)?

The coastal zone is a special place with unique resources; the need for safer highway crossings to support coastal access and recreation while preserving the area's resources has been recommended for a long time. This need has been underscored by the California Coastal Commission as a required component of any highway construction project. The proposed project will necessarily comply with the Local Coastal Program (LCP) and Coastal Act.

One of the biggest challenges is that the corridor must provide for commuters and high volume vehicle traffic on weekends, while maintaining safety and comfort for residents. It must also provide for pedestrians and bicyclists of all ages and abilities who are using the highway right of way or trying to cross. Allowing Highway 1 to accommodate the needs of vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles traveling throughout the Midcoast with limited real estate is a technical challenge and is the driving force behind this project.

C. EFFECTIVENESS

1. Performance projections for overall project - Provide current conditions and projections for the following table, based on the best/latest available data. Define the baseline, completion and horizon years. To request data from the TA for this table, please contact Irma Hernandez hernandezi@samtrans.com

Overall Project Performance Metrics	Current/Baseline Conditions Year: 2012	Short term Project Completion Year: 2017		Long term Horizon ² Year: 2032	
		With Project	Without Project	With Project	Without Project
Level of Service	E	D	F	D	F
Average daily traffic volume	14,300	14,300	14,300	14,300	14,300
Vehicle-hours of delay	Data not available				
Person-throughput per hour (for HOV projects only)	N/A				
Accident data (Collisions/fatalities per vehicle-mile travelled)	Data not available				

2. Describe how and the extent to which the overall project will mitigate current and future congestion (i.e. reduce merge/weave conflicts, address bottlenecks, and/or smooth out uneven vehicular travel flow. (Attach a map or schematic sketch if available)

The overall project will provide relief to the existing, significant current congestion on Highway 1 at the Midcoast and the anticipated increased future congestion. It will help reduce bottlenecks and smooth vehicular flow as well. There are heavy demands on Highway 1 in these communities – especially on the weekends and during special events, there is a large influx of long-distance and regional visitors to the area, causing significant traffic and long waits. This leaves residents feeling frustrated, unable to move about in their local areas, as traffic is too heavy to use the highway by car. Chores as simple as going to the grocery store can become an afternoon event. Because Highway 1 has only one lane in each direction and there are few left turn pockets in the project area, those wanting to reach area destinations must stop and wait until they can turn, backing up traffic behind them.

The overall project will implement measures that will significantly relieve these issues, including safe crossings for non-vehicular travel, which will reduce vehicle backups related to unanticipated/spontaneous pedestrian crossings and “pocket”-type left turn lanes to relieve bottlenecks and smooth out the traffic flow. The elements we are pursuing are designed to alleviate traffic congestion, not reduce traffic levels. We do not have the data necessary to determine future traffic levels.

² Horizon year is defined as 20 or more years after the completion of the project.

D. POLICY CONSISTENCY

1. Adopted Plans and Policies- List specific plans and/or policies (regional, county, local, other, etc.) in which the overall project is included.

Document Title	Year Approved	Section/ Page #	Link to online document(s)*
San Mateo County Local Coastal Program Midcoast Update	Pending	Policy 2.56g, p. J.2; Policy 2.57a.2, p. J.3; Policy 11.26e&f, p. J.4; Policy 10.37.1.b.4.c, p. M.2; Policy 10.37.1.b.5.e, p.M.3	http://www.co.sanmateo.ca.us/bos.dir/BosAgendas/agendas2011/Agenda20110524/20110524_m_9.pdf
San Mateo County Comprehensive Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan	Sept. 8, 2011	Page iii, Goals 1 - 5 Page 7-8, Policies 1.2 & 1.3 Page 9, Policy 4.1	http://www.ccag.ca.gov/pdf/plans-reports/SMC%20Bike%20Plan%202011/CBPP_Main%20Report_Sept2011_FINAL.pdf

* If not available online, attach relevant pages as pdfs.

2. If the description of the proposed overall project is different from that of the project listed in the plans/policies documents, explain the reason for the difference.

NOT APPLICABLE

E. SUSTAINABILITY

1. Indicate the percentage of the overall project that will be operational improvements and/or infrastructure expansion:

Operational Improvement	Infrastructure Expansion	Total
100%	0%	100%

2. Check the box indicating the impacts the overall project would have on the following factors.

	Positive +	Neutral =	Negative -
Transit	X		
Biking	X		
Walking	X		
Transit-oriented development	X		

3. [*Optional, 100 word maximum*] Describe any particular impacts that the overall project would have on transit, biking, walking, and/or transit-oriented development.

The overall project is designed to have positive impacts on transit, biking and walking. Left turn pockets will help reduce long back-ups on Highway 1; therefore vehicles, including buses, will be able to travel through the area more efficiently. This will improve the public transit experience for current riders and make it more attractive to potential riders. Additionally, the project contains strategies designed to encourage biking and walking. Increasing the ability for pedestrians and bicyclists to safely cross Highway 1 will help encourage non-vehicular modes of transportation and reduce unsafe situations, including people randomly darting across the highway to cross.

F. FUNDING AND BUDGET (COST-EFFECTIVENESS)

1. Project Scope Funding and Budget (Round figures to \$1,000s):

Project Scope Phases	Total Cost Estimate (A+B+C)	Current Measure A request (A)	Prior Measure A approved funding (B)	Other Funding (C)	Source of Other Funding	Note
Preliminary Planning (e.g. Alternatives Analysis, Feasibility Study)	\$ 400,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$150,000	SMC Budget	
PID	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$0	\$0		
Environmental (PA&ED)	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0		
Design (PS&E)	\$900,000	\$900,000	\$0	\$0		
Right of Way	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$0		
Construction	\$0	\$0	\$	\$		
Other:	\$	\$	\$	\$		
Subtotal:	\$1,650,000	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$150,000		

2. Leveraged/matching funds for the Project Scope (Round figures to \$1,000s):

Funding Sources for the Project Scope	Amount	Percentage
Measure A Highway funds (Prior and this Request)	\$0	0%
Measure A Local Streets & Transportation	\$0	%
Non-Measure A funds (Prior and current)	\$150,000	10%
Total	\$150,000	10%

3. Overall project cost estimate:

Overall project cost estimate: (best/latest available information):	\$1,650,000
Source / basis for the cost estimate:	SMC Staff estimate

G. EASE OF IMPLEMENTATION

1. Project Scope Participants: List the agencies, regulatory agencies, and major stakeholders who will be involved with implementing the project scope.

Project Scope Phases	Participants
<i>Preliminary Planning</i> (e.g. Alternatives Analysis, Feasibility Study)	SMC Planning Dept., CalTrans, SMC Public Works, SMCTA, C/CAG, MCC
<i>PID</i>	SMC Planning Dept., CalTrans, SMC Public Works, SMCTA, C/CAG, MCC
Environmental (PA&ED)	SMC Planning Dept., CalTrans, SMC Public Works, SMCTA, C/CAG, MCC
Design (PS&E)	SMC Planning Dept., CalTrans, SMC Public Works, SMCTA, Calif. State Parks, Committee for Green Foothills, Coastside Bicycle Coalition, Residents, MCC, C/CAG
Right of Way	SMC Public Works, SMCTA, MCC, C/CAG
Construction	
Other:	

2. Project Scope Responsibilities: List the agency (or indicate if it will be a consultant) that will be responsible for the applicable duties of the project scope. *[Repeat table for each phase if project scope includes multiple phases.]*

Duty	Responsible Party	Notes
Technical implementation (<i>Produces the deliverable/product</i>)	SMC Planning Department, SMCTA, Consultants	Planning Department staff will oversee work by consultants
Enters into Funding Agmt. with the TA	SMC Planning Department	
Prepares Progress Reports for the TA	SMC Planning Department/DPW, Consultants	Planning Department staff will oversee work by consultants
Prepares Invoices to submit to the TA	SMC Planning Department/DPW, Consultants	Planning Department staff will oversee work by consultants
Project Management (day-to-day)	SMC Planning Department, SMCTA	
Project Oversight	SMC Planning Department, SMCTA	
Budget Management	SMC Planning Department	
Leads coordination with Caltrans	SMC Planning Department, SMCTA	
Lead coordination with regulatory agencies	SMC Planning Department, SMCTA	
Leads coordination with other stakeholders	SMC Planning	

	Department	
Outreach	SMC Planning Department, Consultants	
Other		

3. Which participants have agreed to their responsibilities as listed in the table above?

All participants have agreed to their respective roles and responsibilities.

4. What will the TA's role be in the project scope? *Check one.*

- Only as the funding agency providing Measure A funds.
- TA will be requested to support project scope implementation.
- TA will be requested to lead project scope implementation.

Have you spoken with the TA about their potential role in the project scope implementation?

- Yes
- No

5. Have any non-sponsor stakeholders taken a formal position on the overall project? Attach any letters, resolutions, meeting minutes, etc. documenting their positions.

- Yes
- No

6. [250 words maximum] Externalities: Discuss any potential issues, or resolution outcomes that would affect the delivery/implementation of the overall project, such as funding, schedule, environmental issues, or multiple-agency consensus.

Should the County receive partial funding for this project scope, the overall project schedule may need to be adjusted as the various elements are phased in more slowly.

Although the County is confident multiple-agency consensus is assured among the partner agencies and CalTrans, the concept of widening Highway 1 is of concern to the California Coastal Commission. Although the project will not include any infrastructure expansion, the Coastal Commission has taken the position in the past that adding left turn lanes on the highway is the first step to adding lanes. Ensuring that the Coastal Commission understands and agrees that this project will not lead to widening the Highway may take additional time and processes.

7. [250 words maximum] Community Opinion on the overall project: What is the level of interest in the project in the wider community? Have any specific concerns been raised? Provide available documentation (e.g. letters expressing interest [support, opposition, etc], media content, etc.)

There is widespread community interest in this project, particularly since it will relieve congestion in the Midcoast and provide increased safety. Local residents,

bicycle groups, community-based organizations and the Midcoast Community Council (MCC) have been instrumental in providing input on and defining the project. MCC is an elected Municipal Advisory Council to the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors, serving the citizens of the unincorporated Midcoast in Miramar, El Granada, Princeton, Moss Beach, and Montara. Please see attached letters from the MCC regarding the project (Attachment 4d and 5).

There is strong community consensus that safety and mobility be improved for vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists; however, it has been a challenge to achieve consensus on exactly how to achieve these goals. The project scope will bring the items that, by consensus, are the top priorities for the Midcoast communities to the construction phase. Concerns that have been raised include residents wanting to ensure the unique Midcoast character is maintained, while safety is improved and congestion relieved; and particularly that infrastructure expansion will not be “triggered.”

Please see attached letters, emails and newspaper articles (Attachment 5) relating to the project as well as community input from meetings and focus groups located in the appendices of the “Highway 1 Safety and Mobility Improvement Study.” (links have been provided in section II A.2. of this application).

H. ECONOMIES OF SCALE

1. *[250 word maximum]* Describe any economies of scale (cost, funding, schedule, environmental impacts, land use, other efficiencies) which might be leveraged between the project scope, overall project and other projects.

The County has identified the CalTrans Cycle 5 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP)/Cycle 3 High Risk Rural Road Program (HR3) as a potential source of funds to leverage this project scope. Measure A Bicycle funds have also been identified for a trail to be constructed (as another project) that would potentially utilize these crossings.

I. SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS-

Questions I.1. through I.3 apply to ALL applicants.

1. *Land Use:* To what extent does the overall project support regional, county or local land use policies and/or designations? For example, does the project support any Priority Development Area, General or Specific Plan proposals?

The project involves an area that is designated by The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) as a Rural Community Investment Area, which has the same funding priority as a Priority Development Area, but is defined as, “centers and corridors of economic and community activity surrounded by agricultural, resource, or protected conservation lands.” ABAG states that, “These districts present an opportunity to preserve a rural character and scale while integrating a range of housing types, local retail, and cultural and civic activities. In some cases, these elements are already in place, while in others additional planning and investment can help create a more complete community. In addition to a diversity of land uses and an inviting public realm, strong pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between the

area and surrounding neighborhoods are key components of Rural Community Investment Areas.” The project is consistent with Rural Community Investment Area policies and goals in that it is not intended to draw significant new jobs or housing, but preserve the area’s unique character while improving mobility as well as non-vehicular travel.

The project is consistent with the land use and other policies contained in the San Mateo County Midcoast Local Coastal Program (LCP).

2. Check the box indicating the impacts of overall project on the following factors:

Factors	Positive	Neutral	Negative
Specific land use development projects		X	
Disadvantaged populations and/or communities of concern	X		
HOV/ HOT / Express lanes		X	
Freight / truck / goods movement	X		

3. *[Optional, 100 word maximum]* Describe any particular impacts that the overall project would have on land use/development projects, disadvantaged populations, HOV networks, and/or freight movement.

The project addresses the existing needs of geographically isolated, rural communities rather than supporting development. The project provides alternatives to vehicle dependency along with increased safety and mobility, which helps protect the coastal communities. Additionally, implementing elements that increase vehicle mobility in the area will ultimately result in freight movement becoming more efficient.

Answer questions 1.4 through 1.6 only if **PRELIMINARY PLANNING or PID** is part of the project scope.

4. What are the specific outcomes desired from the preliminary planning/PID phase (e.g. policy direction, deliverables)?

The outcome is to move from concept to engineered drawings. The preliminary phases will result in a detailed project design that ensures concepts are consistent with community needs, desires, and requirements as well as CalTrans requirements.

5. What are the opportunities/constraints/parameters for this preliminary planning/PID phase?

The preliminary planning phase included in this project’s scope offers the opportunity to respond to the needs expressed by the communities for better traffic circulation during busy times and improved access to enhance the coastal recreational experience. During this phase, the project partners will confirm that the project elements can be constructed within the existing right of way and ensure that the project is compliant with Coastal Act and CalTrans standards.

6. Is this an update of past planning documents? When was the original completed and why is an update needed?

This is not an update of past planning documents. This project scope moves the overall project to the construction phase.

Answer questions I.7. through I.8 only if **ENVIRONMENTAL** is part of the project scope.

7. What level of environmental clearance is needed for the overall project?

- | <u>CEQA</u> | <u>NEPA</u> |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> CE | <input type="checkbox"/> Listed CE |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Negative Declaration | <input type="checkbox"/> Documented CE |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mitigated Negative Declaration | <input type="checkbox"/> EA |
| <input type="checkbox"/> EIR | <input type="checkbox"/> EIS |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (list) | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (list) |

8. Is this an update of past planning documents? When was the original completed and why is an update needed?

This is not an update of past planning documents.

ATTACHMENT INDEX

Attachment	Description
Attachment 1a	Project scope, Midcoast Corridor Observation and Issues
Attachment 1b	Pedestrian Crossing and Left Turn Lane at Gray Whale Cove
Attachment 1c	Pedestrian Crossing and Raised Medians in Montara
Attachment 1d	Pedestrian Crossing, Left Turn Lane, and Raised Medians in Montara
Attachment 1e	Pedestrian Crossings and Raised Medians in Moss Beach
Attachment 1f	Pedestrian Crossings at Surfer's Beach
Attachment 1g	CalTrans Project: Left Turn Lanes in Montara
Attachment 2	San Mateo County Board of Supervisors Board Resolution
Attachment 3	Non-Supplantation of Funds Certification
Attachment 4a	Letter of Support from the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors
Attachment 4b	Letter of Support from Assemblyman Jerry Hill
Attachment 4c	Letter of Support from State Senator Leland Yee
Attachment 4d	Letter of Support from the Midcoast Community Council
Attachment 4e	Letter of Support from the Pillar Ridge Homeowners Association
Attachment 4f	Letter of Support from the Coastside Bicycle Coalition
Attachment 5	Community Opinion