

Circulation and Mobility Project

San Martin Area Community Meeting Summary Report

The Santa Clara County Roads and Airports Department and Santa Clara County Planning Department held a community meeting to discuss the County General Plan Circulation and Mobility Element's proposal for the county unincorporated road system. The PowerPoint presentation covered the proposed road system as well as policy direction regarding private roads. The meeting was held on August 26, 2014, from 6:30 – 8:30 p.m. at the Lions Club of San Martin at 12415 Murphy Avenue in San Martin. Dan Collen, Deputy Director, Santa Clara County Roads & Airports Department; Dawn Cameron, County Transportation Planner, Santa Clara County Roads & Airports Department; Bill Shoe Principal Planner, Planning Office, Santa Clara County; Will Fourt, Planner, Santa Clara County Parks Department; Ivana Yeung, Planner, Santa Clara County Roads & Airports Department; Michelle Hunt, Project Manager, Hexagon Transportation Consultants; and Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies staffed the event. Approximately thirty (30) community members attended the meeting.



After the twenty-minute orientation presentation, attendees asked questions of the staff in attendance. The following is a list of the questions and the staff responses. After the formal question and answer period, the attendees stayed to ask further questions of the staff and utilize the display boards and available alternative cross-section graphics to articulate their issues, support and/or concerns. In addition, comment cards were available at the meeting and seven cards were submitted at the end of the meeting. The cards are transcribed at the end of this report.



Comment/Question	Response
How was meeting noticed? E-list didn't happen? This community prefers a mailed notice. Utilize the Airport noticing list.	Thank you for the feedback. The team did utilize the available email lists. We will check on the lists. It is difficult for the County to send notices in the mail to all the interested parties since this is a County-wide project.
Send postcards to San Martin addresses.	Comment noted.
Can people go to the upcoming Morgan Hill and Gilroy meetings and get this same information?	Yes and the materials will be posted on the project website.
Will there be another round of outreach?	Yes

Comment/Question	Response
What are the plans for San Martin Avenue? Looks like a make-over. What are the plans for Monterey Road and Route 101 area?	San Martin Avenue between Monterey and the Post Office has already been improved from a Complete Streets perspective with the recent sidewalk project. There are no plans to add lanes and the map will be revised to remove the “trail” line for this segment.
San Martin Avenue is strange with north side and south side having different treatments.	This is on purpose to respect the current land uses along the street.
Will unique treatments happen throughout the county?	Yes, the General Plan can accommodate some degree of flexibility.
I am enthusiastic about what you are showing regarding the trails system.	Comment noted.
In front of the welding shop on San Martin Avenue, the treatment was presented to the San Martin Planning Advisory Group who concurred with that approach.	Yes, that is true.
Everyone was pleased with how that San Martin Avenue sidewalk project outreach and special consideration was conducted. The Morgan Hill Times will be doing a feature to recognize this project.	Comment noted.
Please think about San Martin Avenue as one special area between Monterey Road and the Post Office/the creek.	Map will be revised to remove trail line for this segment and plans will be consistent with having sidewalks on this segment of San Martin Avenue.
I appreciate the stop signs that have been added for traffic calming.	Comment noted.
I love the treatment in downtown San Martin and I like this plan’s flexibility.	Comment noted.
Gravel trucks go too fast on the north part of Center Avenue, north of San Martin Avenue—they are avoiding the scales but also doing this run empty.	The scales can take time and include safety checks so it is not always about truck weight. We will look into this.
Can McConnell Road (off Murphy) get a gate? It is a dead end street and we get turn around traffic.	No, it cannot be gated because it is a public street. A “No Outlet” sign has been ordered and will be installed.
As a resident of New Avenue, I can attest to a	There are no plans to add travel lanes for New

Comment/Question	Response
lot of cut-through traffic on this street what can be done?	Avenue, but it is a public street so anyone can use it.
I am not sure if or where the easements are related to my property. Is there somewhere to find that information?	There are APN reports that have that information on the County Assessor web page. A title report would have that information. The Planning Department staff can help find you information.
If the deadline for the process is January 2015, when did you find out? Why is this project such a rush? Where is the federal money being spent now—what projects?	The federal dollars get used on both maintenance and capital projects. The MTC sets the deadline. Many jurisdictions are in the same boat. We have been working on this project in a very accelerated schedule and have done many things to advance this work to get to point to take a lot of public comment prior to the deadline. The MTC deadline was already moved back. We hope to meet the January deadline, if not we will ask for an extension.
I am very enthusiastic about this project. How can I help?	If you signed in tonight, you will be notified about the next steps in the process. You could attend and speak or write a letter of support.
What is the high speed rail impact on these projects? I do not hear anything about coordination with that project.	The planning for high speed rail has focused on the Central Valley and to south. The County is doing “contingency planning” related to the two alternatives stil under study for South County area. Your point is well taken.
Are you coordinating with the Water District on trails? Are they separate? Will they be joined?	There is a Trails Master Plan for the county that includes the Water District’s trails as well. The actual trails themselves may differ in treatments depending on which agency builds or maintains them.
What are the schedules for doing all these projects?	There is no specific funding tied to this effort; it is a planning effort. This planning is a key step in the grants and funding process.
On VTA projects, they disclose service levels on improvements prior to projects going forward—I cannot tell what will happen if these projects get built? What will be changed? I need cross sections, how will creeks be impacted?	All County projects will undergo appropriate environmental studies including potential impacts to creeks. Project impacts will be disclosed in the environmental studies.
In the areas south on Route 101 south of	The future development is accounted for in the

Comment/Question	Response
Cochrane—how does new development impact the freeways and the roads to the freeways?	model. Route 101 is a state facility and VTA plays a role in getting those improvement projects prioritized and funded. The modeling does assume the VTA’s express lane project for Route 101.
What about soundwalls? Traffic has increased—Can walls on Route 101 be extended to Tenant?	That is a state facility not a county facility. The state has standards that must be met to trigger a wall. Usually walls go in when widenings occur but not without a project.
Private Roads should be considered as part of the grid if necessary to circulation needs.	Comment noted.
Trash gets dumped on our private road, what can the county do about that? We do prefer to keep our private road private.	The county does not maintain private roads without a maintenance agreement. Comment noted.
Will this new plan end up reducing plan lines?	Only in a very few cases. What is more likely is that the wider right-of-way will be utilized to accommodate bike lanes, trails or turning lanes instead of widening projects. There are “complete street” goals that have been adopted that prioritize making improvements for bicycle and pedestrians.
Can we “argue” for our street width.	Yes, each street is a separate case and there is flexibility to accommodate many requests.
Will any of these plans impact speed limits.	That is a possibility.
Individual comments made after the meeting to staff—not on cards:	
Equestrian needs have been taken into account for this area; however equestrian needs should be accommodated up through Coyote Valley and beyond.	The trails plan does include equestrian needs through Coyote Valley.
A resident on New Ave. inquired about feasibility of addressing the safety and other problems associated with the “zig-zag” on New Ave” adjacent to Harvey Bear Ranch County Park and just south of San Martin Ave, far eastern side of San Martin	Comment noted.
Groups of cyclists on New Avenue and other roads are not abiding by stop signs, etc,	Comment noted.

Comment/Question	Response
especially when riding in large groups	
There is high equestrian demand on Murphy Ave from Tennant to Middle, east on Middle, and then on Sycamore from Middle to San Martin.	There is a proposed parallel trail along the East Little Llagas Creek. Staff will follow up with the Water District on the status of this trail. If it is determined that it will not serve the community's equestrian needs, the project team will review the road plan to see if this segment of Murphy and Sycamore should be identified for a trail.
Request for all cross-sections to be on the web—not just those in the presentation.	All cross-sections will be posted on the web site.
San Martin Ave is the only proposed East/West connection for equestrians and is currently not the best route to cross 101. Currently, equestrians prefer Church Ave as a way to cross 101. Also, if a trail is not included along San Martin Ave in the downtown area, this makes the East/West connection harder for equestrians, who are forced to ride on the sidewalk.	Staff has reviewed the trails plan with the Parks Department and is proposing to add a trail segment to Church Avenue between Monterey and Center to provide an additional option for crossing US 101.
92' ROW is too wide for a two-lane street. The County should return excess ROW to adjacent property owners.	Comment noted.
<u>Comment Card Comments:</u>	
I live on E. San Martin Ave. Even though it's a major feed to 101, I don't believe there's enough traffic to warrant a center lane. I am also concerned that my well house may be eaten up with the easement. I ride my horse regularly out my driveway down to Harvey Bear so would appreciate a designated trail which I don't mind sharing with mountain bikers and pedestrians. Drainage is a major concern also and like the ideas of swales. Need bridge widening out ditch between center Center and Foothill.	Center or left turn lanes would be added as a safety measure where needed. A trail connection from E. San Martin Ave to the Park is included in the proposed plan. Drainage improvements will be made in conjunction with any road improvement projects and bridges will be widened as funding becomes available.
I am not in favor of 4 lanes on San Martin Avenue after the overpass. Very expensive. Would be a raceway coming from New and	The proposed plan removes the 1971 plan to widen San Martin Avenue to 4 lanes and proposes a trail alongside San Martin Avenue

Comment/Question	Response
<p>Pacheco Pass especially at commute times. Don't need sidewalks. Access to fields would be difficult with sidewalks and swales etc.</p>	<p>to serve non-motorized users. The only sidewalk for San Martin Avenue will be the sidewalk already built in the commercial core area between Monterey and Post Office.</p>
<p>I am strongly opposed to widening New and San Martin Avenues. If more ability to move traffic is needed, widen 101 or even Monterey Avenue or Santa Teresa. We do need better provision for pedestrian/equestrians and other users of the road side. County Roads badly need better maintenance.</p>	<p>The proposed plan removes the 1971 plan to widen New Avenue and San Martin Avenue to 4 lanes and proposes trails alongside both roads.</p>
<p>Poor communication. Leave South County alone.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>The meeting was very informative and felt County does have San Martin's best interest at heart.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>I am against the project. I want New Avenue to stay the way it is. Finish the freeway from 152 to 101 and get the traffic off New Avenue.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
<p>Is there a future plan for "soundwalls" on 101 from San Martin Exit to Tennant Exit—mainly the east side on the side where Santa Clara Water District road is also maintained?</p>	<p>Soundwalls along 101 is a responsibility of Caltrans and would only be added if they met Caltrans cost-effectiveness criteria and in conjunction with a 101 improvement project</p>

Meeting Summary prepared by Apex Strategies.