

HIGHWAY 1/MANOR DRIVE OVERCROSSING IMPROVEMENT PROJECT COMMUNITY MEETING

Summary of Community Meeting #3

Tuesday, April 18, 2023

The City of Pacifica hosted a community meeting on Tuesday, April 18, 2023 from 6:00-8:00 p.m. to discuss the Highway 1/Manor Drive Project. The meeting was held at the City Hall Council Chambers facility at 2212 Beach Street in Pacifica. Approximately eighty (80) community members attended the meeting. This was the third community meeting regarding this planning effort with this Project Team; the first meeting was held in November 2018 and the second meeting was held in May 2019. In addition to the Project Team, City Mayor Pro-Tem Sue Vaterlaus and City Councilmember Christine Boles attended the meeting.

After a half hour open house period where community members could review the project boards and interact with the project team, the meeting facilitator convened the formal meeting at 6:30 p.m. The facilitator, Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies, explained the meeting format and asked questions of the audience about the noticing of the meeting. Ninety plus percent of the meeting attendees indicated they received one of the 3,400 mailed postcards. About fifteen percent attendees indicated they saw a posting of the meeting notice on NextDoor. Twenty percent of the audience saw the story in the Pacifica Tribune, while the email notification was also seen by about fifteen percent of the attendees. The City Council announcement, a neighbor and the city's newsletter were also credited as notifying community members of the meeting.

Approximately a third of the attendees indicated they attended the first meeting in November 2018 and approximately one half of the attendees attended the meeting in May 2019. Attendees were asked to dot their location (residence and/or business) on a vicinity map. Consistent with the earlier meetings, most of the attendees were from the immediate project area.

Lisa Peterson, Public Works Director, and Roland Yip, City Project Manager, welcomed the attendees and introduced the Project Team.

Ramsey Hissen, Consultant, spoke to a PowerPoint presentation. The presentation was given to orient the attendees to the existing conditions in the project area including existing traffic congestion and roadway deficiencies. He then covered the goals of the project and the feedback received at the earlier community meetings regarding the project details. The next part of the presentation covered work accomplished since the last community meeting, including meetings with Caltrans and SAMTRANS as well as a review of the updated designs for the Manor Overcrossing area and a proposed new design for the Highway 1 Northbound (NB) on-ramp. The presentation concluded with an explanation of the schedule and next steps.

There was a forty-minute question and answer period immediately following the PowerPoint presentation. The comments and questions asked by the public are captured below.

Questions during the Question-and-Answer period:

- When will the decision on what will be built get made? (In about a year, plus)
- Who makes that decision? (City Council in about a year)

- Will Pacifica people have a voice in that decision? (Yes)
- Will there be a staff recommendation? (Staff will likely present options and the alternatives for the Council to choose)
- Was Oceana at Paloma considered for the on-ramp? (No)
- How long has Paloma Overcrossing near Francisco Blvd been under construction? (While it was designed three years ago, construction only recently started)
- Will the public be notified of the next meeting with postcards? (Yes)
- In the previous meetings no-build option was not discussed. Why is that an option now? (We are now in a Caltrans process, per Caltrans procedures a “No Build option” is always considered)
- Who can we contact/regarding Milagra? (City staff is available not only tonight but through calls or email)
- Are there different construction timeframes for each alternative? (No, the construction periods would be similar)
- What about structural integrity? (While the bridge is old it could be retrofitted and added onto; however, a retrofit will eventually be needed)
- What is the cost difference between the options? (The detailed cost estimates have not yet been done. The expected difference is about \$2M, with the retrofitting of the bridge being the cheaper option over brand new)
- Would the bridge be open to traffic during construction? (Yes)
- Is the capacity on the bridge the same between the options? (Yes)
- Is there an opportunity to swap the ramp money from Alternative 2 into Alternative 1 to help with the cost of the project? (Not really, none of the construction money is in hand yet)
- There are three on-ramps very close to one another. Are there traffic densities studies? (The traffic consultants have looked at the proximity and the function of the proposed on-ramp)
- I am a public transit user, specifically a bus user, it is not safe out there today. I often have to stand in the street because of inadequate space for buses to pull in at bus stops, which causes conflicts with vehicles parking. Bus turns are dangerous. (The team has met with SAMTRANS on the bus operations and we are designing the new bridge to take into account the pedestrians and transit users)
- I am concerned about the increase in traffic with both cars and bikes, I think the City and the traffic study should look at the increase in traffic in the neighborhoods. (If there are big impacts there can be traffic calming elements added to the area)
- Milagra Drive will be a four-way bottleneck, concerned about traffic safety, this is too much, (Comment noted)
- Why are traffic lights necessary? (Traffic volumes that reach a certain level trigger or warrant traffic lights. In this case, the traffic volumes are forecasted to warrant the addition of lights)
- I think the additional traffic should mean we get traffic crossing guards near the schools. (While crossing guards are not anticipated and are not part of the project, there are traffic calming elements that can be added as well as Safe Routes to School grants that could be pursued)

Community members were asked to spend a half hour going to the displays and interact with project team and City staff. After the second open house period, the group reconvened, and the team members highlighted what they heard and topics raised during one-on-one discussions. Those comments are captured below. The report-outs from staff are identified by staff expertise and order of report-out. Staff were encouraged to indicate “ditto” when major themes had already been discussed due to the late hour.

Engineer #1

- Parking and parking replacement

Traffic #1

- Impacts on traffic during construction of overcrossing
- Induced traffic concern
- School safety at both the high school and the elementary school
- Parking
- Whether a roundabout was considered (yes)
- Milagra Drive

Traffic #2

- Signal efficiency compared to stop signs to move traffic through the area
- Pros and cons of the on-ramp
- Bike, ped and transit safety

Engineer #2

- Bike facilities and possibility of protected bike freeways
- Staged construction
- Traffic signal optimization—City vs Caltrans control of signals
- Ramps at Paloma and Monterey

Engineer #3

- Roundabout at Paloma (there was a study)
- The process being a waste of time, no build
- Handicapped parking—request not to remove it or change it
- Consideration of Oceana to the west for additional parking
- Coordination with City’s bike/pedestrian Master Plan (Yes)

Environmental #1

- Loss of parking and resulting small business impacts
- Changes in traffic patterns
- Schools and bike/pedestrian access
- Dedicated bike/pedestrian overcrossing landing at Walgreens parking area along Palmetto on the west side and the landscaped median along Oceana on the east side
- Coordination with City’s bike/pedestrian plan and City’s housing element

- Additional housing
- Making the Project Area bigger for study purposes

City #1

- Ditto
- Questions about City projects
- Housing element
- On-ramp northbound and southbound

City #2

- Ditto
- Parking for bakery
- Parallel parking versus angled parking
- Community business impacts
- Traffic signals—need for pilot project
- School drop-off
- Bike lanes beyond project limits and City's Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan
- Freeway ramps

Outreach #1

- Multiple people expressed concerns regarding loss of parking for bakery and dry cleaners
- Student safety at schools
- Need for signal synchronization/coordination, coordination is key
- Need for City's Housing element to be considered
- We should get a brand new bridge the difference in cost is pennies on the dollar compared to the value of a longer life span for the bridge for future generations, greater good down the road
- Expand the study area to look at all impacts

During the second open house period, comment cards were made available to attendees to record their comments. These are transcribed here:

- No on-ramp at Milagra is needed.
- Strongly oppose on-ramp to Milagra. It is a public safety hazard, a pedestrian hazard and a traffic hazard.
- For Manor and Milagra build, what is the sequence in which the build will be done? Both at the same time? Manor first? Milagra first? Please do a traffic impact study of the build options listed to determine what is the traffic impact during construction if:
 - Manor and Milagra are built together
 - Manor is built first
 - Milagra is built first
- Need a traffic study of use of traffic lights in very short "intersection."

This summary of the meeting was prepared by Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies, who facilitated and documented the meeting.