

Livable Moraga Road

Town Advisory Committee Meeting

July 29, 2014, 6PM, Hacienda de las Flores, La Sala Building

Meeting Notes

In Attendance:

TAC Members: Christine Kuckuk, Planning Commission (CK); Ben Helber, Design Review Board (BH1); Larry Rosenberg, Former Transportation Safety Advisory Committee (LR).

Staff and Consultants: Ellen Clark, Senior Planner (EC) ; Brett Hondorp, Alta Planning and Design (BH2); Kristin Maravilla, Alta Planning and Design (KM)

The meeting began at 6:07pm

No members of the public provided comments on items not on the agenda.

Agenda Item: Discussion of Segment 3 design options.

Ellen Clark, Senior Planner, summarized the agenda and provided background the study process to date.

The TAC provided the following comments on design options for Moraga Road Segment 3, between Donald Drive and Corliss Drive:

- Option A. Short-term: Alta described this option as including the following: drop a lane in the SB direction, add a center turn lane. Phased approach: painted separation at first; enhance over time with more hardscape and width.
- A good portion has sidewalk on (not shown) (CK)
- Note that the drawings show edge of pavement, rather than back of sidewalk (KM)
- Question about how the trail and parking areas might be separated. Options include plastic post/delineators and AC curb. TAC asked for sense of the cost difference between for delineators vs. AC curb. AC curb would be more expensive.
- This option removes a travel lane and narrows the lanes. Question as to whether the Center Turn Lane (CTL) could be converted to a travel lane so there is no loss of capacity. Alta staff noted that the traffic engineer finds CTL provides more benefit than the travel lane (BH)
- Comment from a member of the public that CTLs are “deadly” and that the police chief has stated concerns about the CTL near Rheem.
- Alta staff observed that the accident data didn’t indicate a history of traffic collisions with the CTL.
- TAC members asked if the traffic engineer though the speed limit should be lowered if travel lanes are narrowed. Alta staff responded that the narrowed lanes would likely help people to slow down (and observe the actual speed limit).

- Staff recommended providing both an alternative that retains all lanes (two in each direction) and an option with a CTL, noting that the road has enough excess capacity now to go down to two lanes (one in each direction) without severely impacting traffic flow. The future traffic conditions as we get closer to buildout – 15 to 20 years in the future. Over the long term, Level of Service degrades to Level D for the southbound afternoon (PM) peak.
- Staff noted that the short term option involved little more than repainting, which could occur with relatively minimal cost.
- Members of the public noted the issues and cost with removing the speed bump on Camino Pablo; it's still expensive to remove improvements.
- Regarding the existing lane configurations, staff noted that the through traffic tends to merge into the fast lane. This option proposes a lane elimination (similar to the existing condition), just earlier. A large number of people traveling south turn onto Corliss. The existing condition includes a lane reduction SB in advance of Corliss.
- Alta: Having a “short term” option, just involving repainting lanes, lets people test if the widths are right and if people understand how to use it. It's not a \$5 million improvement upfront
- TAC members: Taking one SB lane out; I think it can work. People will be protected. There are not that many right turns onto Corliss Drive; it's not a significant number.
 - Do we know how many people turn right onto Corliss? Percentage?
- Alta: Southbound LOS goes from A to B with loss of one SB lane (under current conditions).
- TAC: Are there collisions along this segment of Moraga Road, which could justify the need for a CTL?
- TAC: Where do you turn the two lanes SB into one lane? Alta: At Donald. We haven't defined exactly how the taper would work yet.
- Alta: the signal at Donald is helpful, because it provides a natural “break point” where you can have a natural transition from two lanes to one. An approach would be to have a right turn only lane at a signal.
- Alta: Noted that Option A does not include a SB bike lane; all bicyclists will be in travel lane or on Multi Use Path.
- Alta: Avid cyclists will not want to be on MUP. That's more argument not to include a MUP in this segment.
- TAC: A MUP is paramount to this effort; or a more general mission is safe bike/pad access.
- A member of the public in attendance noted that the Town has difficulty paying for maintenance of existing trails. Staff agreed that maintenance is always an issue, and needs to be considered. The existing trail is heavily used and an amenity for the community.
- TAC member suggested there should be sidewalks on both sides, noting that it's more cost effective to build the long-term option than build a sidewalk/curb/gutter.
- Staff: In this option you could show the NB bike lane as a striped shoulder to allow pedestrian and bicyclists. Ideally, the shoulder would be wider than five feet.
- TAC member: I'd like to see another option that is based on the Considered but not Recommended option: try to provide similar short-term option with using only the asphalt;

configure lanes to a narrow enough width to include a sidewalk/pedestrian path. I think I prefer a one SB lane and a CTL; but want to see more safety studies.

- TAC member asked if it a problem having lots of driveways cross the MUP, noting concerns about the need to maintain good sightlines.
- TAC member asked if people own the encroachment into the ROW? (e.g., the private improvements in the Right-of Way) Legal question.
- Response that just because people have put improvements in the ROW, doesn't mean you own the ROW.
- Comment from member of the public that bikes ride in packs along the road, and that it would be problematic to put them on the path.
- TAC: Bus pullouts should be considered, noting that there is a pinch point at Donald Drive SB which could be used for a pull out here.
- Staff: CCCTA needs to be involved in decisions regarding bus stop design and location, but from it's usually not a huge issue to move a stop north or south 100 feet. Bus stops need to include transitions for pulling out of and into travel lanes.
- TAC: Would like to see a short-term Option A that includes two SB travel lanes (no CTL). I would rather have a bike path and all travel lanes rather than a CTL.
- TAC: Do we really understand the safety improvements of adding a CTL? Note that keeping all travel lanes does improve condition for on-street cyclists because it includes a second travel lane in each direction.

Option B Discussion:

- Alta described Option B: Two travel lanes (one NB, one SB), CTL, bike lanes, MUP, sidewalk, parking aisles)
- TAC: How does this affect LOS at Corliss? Response:
 - Signalization is needed for all options, and in current conditions.
 - Signalization would be critical if path is constructed on the west side.
 - Corliss currently operates at LOS F and signalization would improve LOS.
 - Signalization at Corliss is needed. The pedestrian crossing feels unsafe.
 - The Town is collecting developer impact fees for the signal.
- Alta: The MUP transition could be somewhere other than Corliss. There's not a lot going on on the east side.
 - Beyond Corliss, the Hacienda is on the west side; supports having MUP on west side at that point to improve access.
- Option : Considered but not recommended Discussion
 - TAC: This should be left on the table as an option. It doesn't tie us to having a MUP, and meets the project goal of safe bike/pedestrian access on both sides of the road. Keep to minimal change for vehicles.

- If this option were to include a short-term option: add sidewalk, add bike lanes, remove MUP, alternate parking.
- TAC: Has anyone looked at the ROW that we own? We could make this much wider than 80 feet.
 - There are constraints (private improvements), utilities, topo, and creek.
 - Also cost constraints.
 - Is there money there for undergrounding utilities?
 - There are funds for SR2S and bike paths. It's very costly. Using what we have at least initially is a good idea. Some of these options could work. I like the idea of walking from Corliss to the shopping center safely. I think people would appreciate that.
- TAC: Appreciate the low-cost, short-term option; but changing paint later would still have its challenges.
- TAC: Has Via Moraga come into consideration with this project?
 - Staff: Yes, the development includes a new crossing, which is also included in this plan.
- TAC: Breaking the options into short-term and long-term helps people understand what can be done now and later, can test out and make sure it's what you want before investing in more permanent improvements, and good for getting funding. We should maintain this idea of the short-term and long-term when going to the public and the Council.

General Discussion

- TAC: Is the first phase to keep the existing travel lane configuration?
 - Think Option A should still go as presented.
 - Short-term is to add CTL because we have the capacity now.
- TAC: What's it going to cost us and how many feet can we gain without high cost?
 - Alta: Team can put together some rough cost estimates for the short-term (striping removal and new striping)

Summer Outreach Plan

- Staff: We will go out to community to present plan, give people opportunity to weigh in on the options. Town will go to service clubs, Pear Festival, other groups. Public Workshop would be held later. Then staff would take the public input to the Council. Segment 3 has become a focus area, but outreach materials will present the whole corridor. Want this to be a project and plan that has public support.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:00 PM