The questions and answers below have been compiled from community comments at the two community meetings and separate email communications regarding the Pilot.

Q1: Who is BCDC and what is their permitting authority?

A: The Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) is a state agency whose mission is "to protect and enhance San Francisco Bay and encourage the Bay's responsible and productive use for this and future generations." Their jurisdiction and permitting authority include the bay and 100' inland from the bay shore. More details: https://bcdc.ca.gov/bcdc-jurisdiction-authority.html

Q2: Why is BCDC enforcing the 100 yard parking lane 50 years late? Why wasn't the dedicated bike lane at the park installed immediately?

A: Neither current BCDC or County staff were aware of the previous permit requirement until the Bayside Park project resulted in discovery of the 1971 permit. It is not known why the required bike lane was not installed at the time of the 1970's roadway project.

Q3: What communications occurred between BCDC and the County regarding the permit-required bike lane between 1971 (when BCDC was notified that the project was complete, and all requirements were met) and 2020-2021 when the Bayside Park overhaul was planned and executed? Was the issue raised or addressed in any fashion during that half century?

A: There is no record of communications between the agencies regarding the 1971 permit until the Bayside Park project.

Q4: What is the proposed time frame for implementing the pilot project and what are the criteria for measuring whether the trial was successful?

A: The pilot project will be conducted over several months to evaluate its effects through varying conditions, including season, schools being in session, and vacation/holiday periods. The pilot project will start in early spring and continue into early fall. Criteria will include effects on vehicle speeds, volumes, and collisions/safety impacts.

Q5: Can a shorter, 2-week non-holiday test period using stanchions and cones be effective to evaluate the lane changes rather than 6 months?

A: Two weeks is not a sufficient period to evaluate effects since conditions may fluctuate throughout the year.

Q6: Would it be possible to ban parking completely from Loch Lomond traffic light all the way to the quarry, thus avoiding reducing additional lane?

A: Many of the homes that front on eastbound Point San Pedro between Bayview Drive and Bayside Park do not have sufficient ability to accommodate parking on the property and are thus dependent on street frontage parking being retained in that section.

Q7: Has any consideration been given to the possible reduction of car traffic due to improving safety for non-vehicle users?

A: Improved safety for pedestrians and cyclists may result in reduced vehicle trips but it would be speculative as to what that number might be.

Q8: Your diagram indicates that the changes start at the entrance to the Cove HOA but making the right lane a turn only lane approaching Loch Lomond Drive. That would mean vehicles would have to merge left at a curve while at speed and lacking forward visibility.

A: After concerns raised by the community and further evaluation and discussion by the design team, the lane drop will instead be a typical merge occurring after Loch Lomond Drive; both lanes can proceed straight through the Loch Lomond intersection. This merge layout was originally presented at the June 8 community meeting hosted by the Point San Pedro Road Coalition. The merge will begin after Loch Lomond Drive and complete by the beginning of the left turn pocket for Bayview Drive. The plan schematic on the project website illustrates this layout.

Q9: If the parking lane is to the right of the bike lane, will cars cut bicycle riders off when they try to park?

A: For low-turnover parking such as along this section of Point San Pedro the potential conflict between cyclists and parking vehicles is minimal.

Q10: Would a "tuff curb" with upright vertical bollards be useful to delineate the proposed bike lane.

A: Vertical barriers cannot be used in this section because of the need for vehicle access to curbside parking and residential driveways.

Q11: What is the average daily bicycle use between Loch Lomond Drive and Bayside Park?

A: Counts of bicyclists have not been conducted in this section of the roadway. Counts will be conducted as part of the Pilot.

Q12: How will the choice between the two options be made?

A: Compliance with the BCDC permit requirements and consideration for additional benefits including safety improvements, currently-adopted plans and policies, and potential impacts to traffic flow were considered in opting to move forward with the Pilot. Outcomes from the Pilot will be the basis for determining a final layout in conjunction with the upcoming paving project which could be making the Pilot layout permanent, modifying aspects of the Pilot as part of a permanent layout, or reverting to the current configuration with a parking prohibition along the park frontage.

Q13: Has the City agreed to the changes along the esplanade between Main and Riviera?

A: Yes, the City is supportive of proposed conceptual changes along the esplanade.

Q14: How will the trip hazards on the esplanade walkway east of Bayside Park be addressed?

A: The City is working on a maintenance project to replace the worst section of walkway between Peacock Drive and Riviera Drive as part of the citywide maintenance assessment on pathways. The remainder of the pathway will be assessed at a citywide level next fiscal year.

Q15: Has the configuration of the bike lane at the merging point west of Loch Lomond Drive been reviewed by the Bicycle Coalition? It requires bikes to cross over the turn lane while vehicles are trying to merge left.

A: This design concept is a standard weave layout. However, after further evaluation, the merge location has shifted to the east of Loch Lomond Drive – see the response to Question 8.

Q16: Given the concerns on safety, has there been any consideration of reduction of the speed limit on the roadway?

A: Recent state legislation notwithstanding, state law requires the setting of speeds on arterial roadways based on the 85th percentile method which means the posted speed must be within +/-5mph of the speed of 85% of vehicle traffic, based on an engineering and traffic survey.

Q17: What are the pros and cons of extending single lane to Riviera, i.e., safety concerns; how do the quarry trucks factor into the evaluation of this?

A: The pros of extending the single lane to Riviera include a 1) shortened crossing distance for pedestrians at Knight, Peacock, and Riviera, 2) eliminating a point of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, and 3) improved visibility between vehicles and pedestrians. Quarry truck traffic was included in the vehicular counts when they were collected and extending the single lane to Riviera is not expected to have an impact on quarry truck traffic.

Q18: Is it possible for the pilot to fail? Once the re-striping is done, isn't the entire test over?

A: The striping initially would be temporary and, prior to planned pavement maintenance in the fall, data collection would inform whether it is considered successful. There is an opportunity to decide whether to make the pilot configuration permanent, make changes, or to return it to current configuration with parking restrictions if not successful as part of the fall pavement resurfacing project.

Q19: What is the status of safety improvements in the area of the intersection of Pt. San Pedro Road and Riviera Drive to upgrade the traffic signal poles with longer mast arms (the ones hanging over the street) to accommodate additional signal heads above the turn pockets and protected left turns or flashing yellow arrows? If the "lane diet" extends to Riviera Drive, would those safety improvements be affected? If so, how?

A: There are no plans to signalize the intersections of Knight, Peacock, or Riviera. Benefits of a lane diet include a 1) shortened crossing distance for pedestrians at Knight, Peacock, and Riviera, 2) eliminating a point of conflict between vehicles and pedestrians, and 3) improved visibility between vehicles and pedestrians.

Q20: The esplanade to the east of Peacock Drive has flooding into the road at the end near where the wind surfers sail. Will any improvements to the esplanade include sea level rise mitigation?

A: The City is reviewing the maintenance of the levee at the east side. In addition, the city is applying for grants to complete a sea-level rise adaption plan that will include review of the esplanade.

Q21: Will parking be retained at the east end of the esplanade where there is a small "beach" used by sailboarders?

A: Yes, parking will remain unchanged in this area.

Q22: Have stop signs been considered at Beach Drive and Oak (Marine) Drive to allow Chicken Point residents to safely cross and exit to the westbound lanes under this one lane configuration?

A: Stop sign controls on an arterial roadway such as Point San Pedro are not an appropriate solution because of the potential for increased collisions as well as traffic congestion concerns.

Q23: Will the signal lights at the intersection of Point San Pedro Road and Loch Lomond Drive be changed to a 4-way stop to reduce accidents?

A: No, the City is starting the design of adding protected left turns (green arrows) for eastbound and westbound Point San Pedro Road at Loch Lomond. Updates will be provided as the project progresses.

Q24: How do the vehicle traffic counts compare to Las Gallinas, which also has a single lane with a bike lane in a residential area?

A: The City last collected counts on Las Gallinas in 2016. The average daily traffic (ADT) was 7,100. The ADT on PSPR between Main and Biscayne is 8,300, based on counts from 2016.

Q25: If there is NOT a reduction to one lane and parking is removed fronting Bayside park to allow for a bike lane fronting the park, would there be a safety issues raised by using the disabled park spot since a parked car would need to pull into the bike lane?

A: The low turnover rate of parking in the area would not result in any greater conflict than other curbside parking scenarios with non-disabled spaces.

Q26: Is there evidence of an actual problem with cycling now? Have there been any actual accidents with injured cyclists from traffic? Why are we obligated to a plan that occurred 50 years ago without consideration of all of the factors that have changed since?

A: The current situation of cyclists riding in a vehicle lane through an area with high vehicle speeds and limited visibility results in an unsafe condition. To that end, for many years both the City's and County's bicycle and pedestrian master plans have identified the need for dedicated bicycle lanes on Point San Pedro Road as far east as Biscayne Drive. In the last seven years there have been four (city + county) documented bicyclist-related incidents east of Loch Lomond Drive

Q27: How would the County comply with the BCDC permit going forward if the Pilot Project were to fail?

A: Parking for the park would be prohibited, except for the disabled space cut into the curb line.

Q28: What are the funds that are at risk of this bike lane solution is not installed?

A: Not addressing the bike lane requirement by BCDC results in fines accumulating daily. Not addressing this requirement is not an option.

Q29: Where can we find a copy of the plans online?

A: You can find these on the <u>Pilot Project's webpage</u> and links are also provided in a post on NextDoor to the neighborhood.

Q30: How would the changes affect emergency evacuations and access? Would the changes make quick exiting worse due to gridlock?

A. Modifications would involve restriping the eastbound roadway with paint; no modification of curb and median locations would occur. Emergency access/egress would not be affected since the same amount of pavement would be available for use as exists today. Westbound will remain two lanes from Riviera Drive to Grand Avenue

Q31: Why can't the proposed bike lane be next to the curb and have the on-street parking to the left of it to provide a buffer between cars and cyclists?

A. With the sporadic use of on-street parking along the residential and park frontages it is not suitable to have parking away from the curb because the random occurrences of vehicles parked within the roadway would create confusion for motorists and cyclists. Drivers parking in such a situation would

also be stepping into a live traffic lane to access their vehicle, one of the safety concerns that exists currently. Having vehicles parked away from the curb would also create visibility obstructions for other roadway users.

Q32: When would vehicle and bicyclist counts be conducted and for how long?

A. Vehicle and bicyclist counts, along with vehicle speeds, will be collected before any modifications are undertaken and then again when the treatment is in place to measure any changes. Counts are typically at least one week in length (24/7) and not done during holidays, school vacations, etc. to get a representation of traffic patterns and usage throughout the day and account for weekday/weekend variations.

Q33: What are the circumstances that the test period would not be followed by the permanent change?

A. Reconsideration of the layout would result from the pilot's objectives not being achieved, including moderation of vehicle speeds (below the posted speed limit), congestion resulting in lowered vehicle throughput, and/or an increase in collisions attributable to the changed configuration. Of course, with any change there will be a period early on where folks are adjusting behaviors but after a few weeks in things should normalize to better observed its effects.

Q34: Is it possible to do off-peak only lane restrictions, such as having the bike lane in effect only during non-peak periods, i.e. not during the morning or late afternoon to retain two vehicle lanes and to discourage bicycle use during those peak periods.

A. Peak-hour traffic volumes do not warrant two lanes. Having variable traffic and lane-use controls depending on the time of day creates confusion among roadway users. While recreational cyclists can opt to ride at different times, those who are commuting, going to school, or conducting other utilitarian trips do not have the same flexibility.

Q35: Turning left on to or out of Main Drive is dangerous because of obstructed visibility. How does removing a traffic lane not make that worse?

A. The length of the left turn pocket on to Main Drive would not be affected by the reconfiguration. Shifting of the vehicle lane away from the median will result in improved visibility over the current situation in the left through lane. Similarly, for vehicles turning left out of Main Drive, having only one eastbound vehicle lane to account for and having that lane shifted away from the median will improve sight distance and the ability to safely execute the left turn movement.

Q36: How will the County present the results of the pilot and when does the County anticipate making a final determination whether make the lane diet permanent?

A. Restriping will occur in early spring as that kind of work cannot be done in wet weather. Data collection will be done prior to any roadway modifications and then again once said modifications are in place to provide before and after comparative data. A 5-6 month window was identified at the community meeting as a likely period for any demonstration project to ascertain its effects over a range of conditions and seasons, thus sometime late summer/ early fall would be when a final determination could be made, prior to any roadway sealing.

Q37: How would drivers exiting Beach and Marine Drives or those accessing driveways which front on Point San Pedro safely maneuver with only one vehicle lane?

A. For drivers exiting Beach and Marine Drives having a single lane improves visibility as the driver can nose out more than now since the bike lane provides additional buffer space from the single vehicle lane. It will also mean needing to account for only one oncoming lane of eastbound traffic. Shifting the single vehicle lane away from the median provides additional refuge space for merging into westbound traffic. At Beach Road, the median hedge will be trimmed down to further improve visibility for oncoming westbound traffic. For driveways and on-street parking along Point San Pedro, safety is improved for drivers who can slow down and merge into the bike lane to turn into the driveway instead of needing to slow down in an active vehicle lane as the current layout requires. Backing out of those driveways receive the same benefit of increased visibility down the roadway and not needing to back into a live traffic lane.

Q38: What happens when there are left turn lane backups at Main or Knight Drives? The situation at Main Drive is particularly critical since PSP drivers are coming around a curve at speed.

A. Both the Main Drive and Knight Drive left turn pockets are of sufficient length that they can each accommodate 6-7 waiting vehicles, or "storage" out of the through lane. Shifting the single vehicle lane away from the median (2' at Main Drive, 7' at Knight Drive) provides additional space approaching the two intersections, improving driver visibility.

Q39: The Rock Quarry conducts regular sweeping operations on Point San Pedro. How will that be affected with a single lane?

A. There will be no changes to the pavement width so sweeping operations can continue as they do now. Similar to when a driver encounters slow-moving equipment (street sweeper, garbage truck, construction or farm vehicles), when it is safe to navigate around it, one does.

Q40: How will local vehicular traffic have the ability to pass slower quarry and brickyard truck traffic? The lane diet will remove the ability for local traffic to pass the trucks.

A. Eastbound quarry trucks are typically unladen and do not have the same acceleration and speed control issues that a laden truck does, such as with westbound trucks. The lane reduction is only in the eastbound direction. Several commenters who drive the road regularly have noted they do not try to pass the trucks now, particularly between Bayview Drive and Main Drive, because the truck trailers tend to track into the adjacent vehicle lane. With eastbound trucks generally traveling near the posted speed limit now, negative impacts to traffic flow are not expected.