

From: **Tom Edminster** <[REDACTED]>
Date: Thu, Jul 31, 2014 at 4:42 PM
Subject: comments:Draft 2015 TIP and Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis:Calera Parkway Widening: SM-050001, RTP ID 98204
To: info@matc.ca.gov

July 31, 2014

To: MTC Public Information Office
101 Eighth Street
Oakland, Ca 94607

Subject: Comments - Draft 2015 TIP and Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis -

Note: comments sent via email to: info@mtc.ca.gov (as text and ATTACHMENT)

Dear Metropolitan Transportation Commission

I submit the following comments for the **Draft 2015 TIP and Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis**.

I am specifically concerned with the proposed Calera Parkway Widening in County of San Mateo, City of Pacifica. The TIP ID for the Calera Parkway SR1 widening is SM-050001, RTP ID 98204. The Project description listed on the 2015 TIP Projects by County, page 11 of 59, states:

"In Pacifica: Route 1 between Fassler and West Port Dr. : Add an additional lane in each direction."

First, the proposed Calera Parkway-Caltrans Preferred Alternative, expands the existing roadway **from 64 feet**, shoulder to shoulder, to **a width of 148 feet**. Obviously, the proposed Calera Parkway is much bigger than, and adds much more than, one lane in each direction. In fact, it more than doubles the width of the existing roadway on this section of Highway 1 in Pacifica.

That said, the **Project Description is not accurate or adequate** . Using basic math: one 12 foot lane in each direction would add a total of 24 feet to the existing SR1 roadway. Adding 24 feet to the existing SR1 roadway would make it 84 feet wide. The difference of 60 feet in roadway width is significant in the amount of impacts and Right of Way acquisition.

Public Opposition:

1. March 2013

A preliminary petition/letter was presented to the Pacifica City Council in March of 2013, asking them to hold hearings on the CalTrans Draft EIR, citing concerns with the existing CalTrans plans. **I was the co author of this letter and spoke on its behalf.** The City Council was asked to engage in appropriate review and input, engage the Planning Commission and the public in reviewing the DEIR outline, and other possible options. The Council refused to act. No motion was entertained or taken. This was a local authority "default" on oversight and responsible joint planning.
(see attachment; "Letter to the City Council..")

2. April 2014

A petition against the Calera Parkway SR1 widening containing over 1200 signatures, of Pacifica and Bay Area residents, was presented to the Pacifica City Council at their meeting on April 28, 2014.

["To the Pacifica City Council: The Caltrans plan to widen Highway 1 is not good for Pacifica. It will cause more problems than it will solve. I support pursuing a combination of alternatives that can improve traffic congestion on Highway 1 and that will be less damaging to Pacifica.

The Petition supports the action of pursuing a combination of alternatives to improve traffic and reduce congestion on Highway 1. And to Petition for alternatives that are less damaging and disruptive to Pacifica.]

At the Council meeting numerous Residents spoke and let the City Council know the Caltrans plan to widen Highway 1 is not good for Pacifica. And it will cause more problems than it will solve.

As a resident of Pacifica, I signed this petition, also asking the City Council to pursue and identify alternatives to the Calera Parkway, and not to accept the Calera Parkway widening plan proposed for Highway 1 by Caltrans.

In other words, the Caltrans proposal is too Big, and it should NOT go forward until alternatives to widening have been fully explored and considered.

Other agencies and individuals have written: and expressed their concerns regarding the Calera Parkway. In October 2011, the Coastal Commission wrote to Caltrans. In the letter they asked Caltrans to study: ' Alternatives that could meet the purpose and the need for the project, including alternatives that would lessen traffic congestion, but would not result in significant impacts on Coastal Resources, including an analysis of combinations of Alternatives.'

The Coastal Commission letter also states: 'Although rejected Alternatives may not be effective on their own, to make implementation useful, it appears possible that some combination of the rejected alternatives might be used under a no build or reduced build alternative.'

Furthermore, On Wednesday July 9, 2014 the *Pacifica Tribune* reported: Erik Alm, Caltrans district branch chief, recommended preparing a more detailed transportation plan because the proposed Pacifica General Plan, which includes the Calera Parkway widening, would generate more than 100 vehicles per hour during peak hours. Alm also recommended promoting mass transit use, car parks and shuttle services and developing bike routes. I agree that the City of Pacifica should prepare a more detailed transportation plan, one that promotes mass transit use, car parks and shuttle services. And develop bike routes as part of the transportation commuter plan.

Caltrans recently underwent a State Smart Transportation Initiative Review - SSTI. The report was issued in January 2014. As a result of the SSTI Report, Caltrans has taken steps to modernize its focus and Caltrans changed its Mission statement. Unfortunately the Calera Parkway widening proposal is an outdated plan focused on Level of Service Criteria - LOS and geometric solutions. As planned it requires many exceptions to Roadway standards and a huge increase in roadway infrastructure.

What is needed: Generally speaking, We need to apply modern design and transportation planning into the Calera Parkway SR1 project before the Final Design is approved. And we need a plan that incorporates other criteria such as reducing Total Miles driven -TMD, Green House Gases - GHG and Single Occupancy Vehicles - SOV.

What is needed: All these reduction strategies need to be incorporated before the final design phase. And as Branch Chief Alm wrote, we need a plan that promotes mass transit service, car parks and shuttle services and develop bike routes. I also agree that the City of Pacifica should prepare a more detailed transportation plan, and to complete a thorough review of the Alternatives before approving the Final Design.

Moreover, The planning needs to consider The impacts to the Vehicle Activity Forecasts, as listed on table 5, of the Draft Transportation and Draft Air Quality Conformity Analysis. As stated, all categories of Vehicles in Use, Daily Miles Traveled and Engine Starts continue to increase over the next 28 years. Planning and

Implementation of Alternatives is an important strategy towards reduction in reducing vehicle activity in Pacifica and in the Bay Area.

Additional Suggestions:

- a. The City should explore all possibilities for technical assistance in finding alternatives to the CPP, including following up with the MTC's Next Generation Program, call for project funding.
- b. The City should commission a peer reviewed traffic study and assessment that includes current state of the art technologies and strategy to reduce Total Miles Driven-TMD, Green House Gases-GHG and Single Occupancy Vehicles- SOV.
- c. The City should ensure the inclusion of current highway design guidelines and strategies to minimize impacts to coastal resources and land.
- d. The City should determine whether the CPP is consistent with the Pacifica LCLUP and the Coastal Act before it includes the CPP in the GP, and LCUP. Such determination should be included in the DEIR.
- e. The City should ensure that all prior recommendations of the Coastal Commission concerning the Calera Parkway widening are addressed and incorporated into the new GP and LCLUP.
- f. The City should provide or apply for funds to the Pacifica School District and encourage Caltrans/MTC/SMCTA/BAAQMD to provide funds to the District, e.g. through the Safe Routes to School program, to enable the District to study and implement traffic improvement measures.

Furthermore, I agree with all the recommendations to identify alternatives that are less costly, have a smaller footprint, and reduce the environmental impacts to endangered species and habitat, reduced Right of Way acquisition and reduced impact on Coastal Resources.

In closing, The Calera Parkway Widening, has not had the benefit of a Public Hearing by the City of Pacifica. The City of Pacifica has never commented on the CPP in the DEIR of FEIR. The City of Pacifica has not initiated an analysis of the consistency of the CPP to its General Plan or LCLUP or evaluated if the CPP is consistent with the Coastal Act. The California Coastal Commission has permitting authority for the Coastal Development Permit – CDP. The city of Pacifica has not started the CDP permitting process. Furthermore, the City of Pacifica intends to go forward with requesting final design funding for the CPP without knowing if the CPP is consistent with General Plan, the LCLUP or the Coastal Act.

I therefore request that **funding for the Calera Parkway SR1 widening** ---(TIP ID: SM-050001, RTP ID 98204; listed in The Project Description, 2015 TIP Projects by County, page 11 of 59)----**be excluded** until such time as the City of Pacifica and/or Caltrans have conducted **a comprehensive and Peer reviewed study of alternatives to the Calera Parkway Widening of SR1.**

I further request that the 2015 TIP and future TIP **NOT include** the Calera Parkways SR1

- until it is determined by the permitting Agency, that the Calera Parkway SR1 widening is consistent with the Pacifica General Plan, Local Coastal land Use Plan and the Coastal Act; and
- that alternatives have been studied for the Calera Parkway SR1:
- Specifically to reduce congestion and reduce cost,
- minimize project footprint,
- reduce the environmental impacts, Right of Way acquisition and impacts on Coastal Resources.

Sincerely,

Thomas W Edminster

--

Tom Edminster

