

SAN MATEO CENTRAL NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION

San Mateo Central Neighborhood Long Term Neighborhood Strategy



Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates
785 Market Street, Suite 1300
San Francisco, CA 94103

January 2006

Table of Contents

	Page
Chapter 1 Introduction	1-1
Chapter 2 Conflicting Issues.....	2-1
Existing Land Use Zoning.....	2-1
Existing Street Classification	2-1
Trucks through the Neighborhood.....	2-2
Traffic Volume and Speed	2-3
Vehicle Incidents	2-4
Walking and Bicycling Environment.....	2-4
Low Soundwall along US-101	2-5
Future Influence from Proposed Development.....	2-5
Conclusions.....	2-6
Chapter 3 Traffic Calming.....	3-1
Cost of Traffic Calming Measures in Other Studies and Areas.....	3-3
Chapter 4 Recommendations	4-1
A Uniform Central Neighborhood	4-1
Traffic Calming.....	4-2
Walking and Bicycling Environment.....	4-4
Raised Soundwall Along Freeway.....	4-4
Chapter 5 Neighborhood Communication Plan	5-1

Table of Figures

	Page
Figure 1 San Mateo Central Neighborhood	1-1
Figure 2 Neighborhood Street Classification	2-2
Figure 3 Arterials and Collectors Connecting to the Industrial Land Use along S Amphlett Boulevard	2-3
Figure 4 Step 2 Traffic Calming Measures	3-2
Figure 5 Sample Cost Estimates for Individual Traffic Calming Measures.....	3-4
Figure 6 Cost Estimates of Traffic Calming Measures in Bernal Heights, San Francisco (in 2003 dollars).....	3-6



in 1992. In 1995, residents on 5th Avenue defeated their first “big box” development project that would have brought in 70-foot long trucks and further changed the residential character of the neighborhood. A “slow street” campaign was introduced with another petition and the efforts were described in the local newspapers. The campaign was soon replaced by a stop sign campaign, which in five years resulted in 10 four-way stop signs being installed. Findings from a traffic data analysis of the neighborhood intersections showed that there had been 123 injury and hit-and-run accidents between 1995 and 1998. In 1998, Mayor Sue Lempert developed a series of community workshops called Community Compass in San Mateo. Through these workshops a Traffic Calming Committee was created with residents from four residential neighborhoods whose main concerns were traffic impacts. The Committee wanted to see one neighborhood succeed as a demonstration neighborhood for traffic calming devices. The group selected the Central Neighborhood to be the demonstration neighborhood, as it already had shown interest in traffic calming and has an ideal street grid. Block parties, newsletters, educational flyers on traffic calming, and a postcard survey (86% in favor of a traffic circle plan and 13% opposed) eventually led to the installation of a demonstration traffic circle at 5th Avenue and Eldorado Street. In addition, in 2002, the Central Neighborhood Association submitted 40 letters of support endorsing a permanent traffic circle at Fifth and Eldorado to the Public Works Commission. These are the major issues that the Association has worked on over the last ten years.¹

Several large developments are currently being proposed near the Central Neighborhood that will affect it in different ways. The industrial land uses along S Amphlett Blvd also conflict with the neighborhood since there is no direct truck access to US 101. In this memo, Nelson\Nygaard outlines potential solutions to these and other conflicting issues and estimates costs for implementation where possible.

This paper is intended as the starting point for a more intensive conversation with the Central Neighborhood and between the neighborhood and the City of San Mateo. It was funded by the Peninsula Community Foundation with a total budget of \$3,000, at the direction of Laurie Watanuki, President of the Central Neighborhood Association. Due to the small budget, input for this paper was gathered from Laurie Watanuki; Stephen Scott, Principal Planner with the City’s Planning Department; and Gary Heap, City Engineer in the City’s Public Works Department; and generic professional sources. This paper should be used by the neighborhood association to help it clarify its goals and concerns, and to identify potential solutions to address those concerns. It should then be used to help the City of San Mateo understand the priorities of the neighborhood in the ongoing General Plan update process.

¹ Source: Interview with Laurie Watanuki.

Chapter 2 Conflicting Issues

The Central Neighborhood Association has identified several conflicts and issues in their neighborhood they would like addressed. Some of them are not related to planning issues, but rather to enforcement. This memo focuses only on the planning related issues, such as land use zoning, street classification and how traffic calming should be implemented. Enforcement of existing rules is a matter best implemented by the City directly.

Existing Land Use Zoning

The majority of the parcels in the Central Neighborhood are zoned as R2, which in short means that the properties should not house more than two families.

The parcels along S Amphlett and a portion of Claremont are zoned as C4-1, Service Commercial, supporting a broad range of citywide and regional service uses including major automobile and truck repair, construction materials yards, and limited processing of materials. The industrial area along Amphlett is surrounded by residential areas zoned R2, and access to the industrial parcels is entirely via residential streets. This is a major point of conflict for residents.

The parcels along 5th Avenue are zoned as R3, which means that they can be built as multi-family units of medium density, such as rowhouses. The majority of the housing is currently single-family dwellings along this segment.

The west side of Delaware St (Railroad side of the street) is zoned as R4, meaning that high-density multi-family units could be built.

While many residents want to protect the single-family character of the neighborhood, the City is also looking to address regional traffic congestion problems by emphasizing residential infill development near its rail stations. This is another key tension.

Existing Street Classification

Figure 2 and Figure 3 illustrate the streets in and adjacent to the neighborhood that are currently classified as either arterial or collector streets. The reason for having these streets classified as either arterial or collector today is to alleviate the local streets from through-traffic.

Figure 2 Neighborhood Street Classification

	Arterial	Collector	Local
Humboldt St, 10 th to Burlingame	X		
Delaware St, Peninsula Ave to 25 th Avenue	X		
3 rd & 4 th Avenue, US-101 to El Camino	X		
5 th Avenue, Delaware to El Camino	X		
9 th Avenue, Delaware to El Camino	X		
9 th Avenue, Amphlett to Delaware		X	
Grant St, 3 rd Avenue to 19 th Ave		X	
All other neighborhood streets			X

Trucks through the Neighborhood

The industrial businesses along S Amphlett (see Figure 3) include landscaping firms, importers/exporters, auto-related businesses and the San Mateo Times. According to neighborhood residents, several of these businesses have had an increased demand for truck deliveries in recent years. Noise impacts from the trucks are experienced at all hours of the day and night.

The current Municipal Code (Ord. 11.38.130) allows all truck traffic in San Mateo to travel on arterial and collector streets, as well as all local streets to reach these arterials and collectors, as long as the local streets do not prohibit truck traffic. This implies that the trucks with origins in S Amphlett may use both 5th and 9th Avenue to get to the arterials S Humboldt (leading to the truck route on 4th Avenue, and 3rd Avenue if going west) and Delaware Street (for instance to get to SR-92).

Some trucks also use Idaho St to get to the freeway access on 4th Avenue, particularly when other trucks are blocking the exit onto Fifth Avenue from Amphlett Avenue. Many of these streets and intersections that are currently used by semi-trailers and trucks were not designed to carry such large vehicles. Trucks making wide turns in these narrow streets have apparently resulted in trees, utility poles and cable wires being hit and torn down as well as caused cracks to interior walls and exterior damage to eaves and fences.



9th Avenue looking west from S Amphlett



2) they encourage “jackrabbit” behavior, with speeding between signs, 3) when used excessively, they encourage “rolling stops” and therefore reduce pedestrian safety, and 4) they introduce additional noise and pollution from braking and accelerating. Most professional publications on traffic calming recommend the use of “vertical or horizontal deflection devices” – speed humps, traffic circles, chicanes and other means – over stop signs since the former require that all motorists slow down, not just law-abiding ones.

Vehicle Incidents

As already mentioned in the introduction, during a three-year period in the middle of the 1990’s there were 123 injury and hit-and-run incidents within the small neighborhood. New data has been collected from the San Mateo Police Department for the period 2002-2005. The two datasets are not directly comparable, since crash reporting and data collection/entry methods have changed between the two time periods. Even when taking the discrepancies into account, there seems to have been a significant decrease in number of vehicle incidents in the neighborhood. Over the last three years there have been 62 crashes in the neighborhood, with a total of 26 injured people. This is about half as many crashes as in the period between 1995 and 1998. The difference can most likely be related to the implementation of stop signs in the neighborhood, which require all drivers to come to a full stop at the intersections.

9th and 5th Avenues are the two streets in east-west direction (4th, 5th, 7th and 9th Avenues) with most crashes, accounting for almost 75%. Looking in the north-south direction (Railroad, Claremont, Delaware, Eldorado, Fremont, Grant, Humboldt, Idaho and 101-S entrance), Delaware alone accounts for almost 50% of the crashes, followed by Claremont and Idaho with 15% and 10%, respectively. It should also be noted that the 3rd/Humboldt intersection, just north of the Central Neighborhood, accounted for 20 additional crashes.

Walking and Bicycling Environment

All neighborhood streets have sidewalks and Delaware and 9th Avenue have striped bicycle lanes in both directions. Other streets are classified as county bike routes. In addition, several of the streets in the neighborhood are Class II or III bike routes. Some of the strips between the sidewalk and roadway are currently filled with concrete. These could be replaced with vegetation as part of a neighborhood beautification program.

Ever since the Neighborhood Association was established, one of the goals has been to install street lamps throughout the neighborhood. Lighting along streets and sidewalks is uneven in some places due to low and thick vegetation preventing residential illumination from reaching the

streets and the sparseness of streetlamps. The darkness raises safety and security concerns among residents.

In 1999, the Association submitted a lighting program to the City, which responded by installing street lamps in the northeastern section of the neighborhood, along the streets around 5th Avenue. This was funded by the new multi-family Prometheus development between 4th Avenue and 5th Avenue as part of its development agreement and a neighborhood enhancement grant from the City.

It is of great importance to residents that the rest of the neighborhood is equipped with the same type of street lamps for neighborhood safety, security and comfort.

Low Soundwall along US-101

There are neighborhood concerns that the soundwall between S Amphlett and US-101 is too low. The soundwall is currently 8-1/2 feet high, compared to 14 and 16 feet high in adjacent neighborhoods along US-101. The reason for the low soundwall is that the industrial businesses along S Amphlett want to be visible to the traffic passing by on the freeway.



View of soundwall from 9th Avenue, looking north

Future Influence from Proposed Development

The San Mateo Corridor Plan is a policy document that provides a framework for the long-term development (2004-2020) of the Corridor Plan Area, which is composed of approximately 607 acres of the non-residential lands between El Camino Real and Highway 101, and between 16th Avenue and the San Mateo/Belmont border. The Plan identifies goals and objectives intended to facilitate Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) in the Corridor Plan Area, creating an integrated pattern of land use, urban design, and circulation that is compact, pedestrian-friendly, and reduces over-reliance on the automobile.

The Corridor Subareas are the Hayward Park Area, the Bay Meadows II Area and the El Camino Real Corridor, with a total of up to 4,000 new housing units, almost 4 million square feet of new office space and about 700,000 square feet of new retail. The Bay Meadows II Project, located south of SR-92 at the existing Racetrack, is proposing to build 1,000-1,500 residential units, 1 million to 1.5 million square feet of office, and 150,000 square feet of retail (all of which are also included in the Corridor Plan).

The Environmental Impact Reports for the projects state that these new developments “are not expected to lead to a noticeable traffic increase on Delaware Street north of Concar Drive. Because Delaware Street is classified as arterial and because the increased volume would be within

the typical range for arterials, traffic impacts to Delaware Street would be less than significant. Because no significant increase in traffic would occur on these streets, it can be concluded that smaller neighborhood streets served by these larger streets would similarly not experience significant increases in traffic.” Nevertheless, some traffic increase can be expected in the Central Neighborhood, which lies between Bay Meadows and Downtown San Mateo.

Various other proposed transportation projects raise concerns for Association members, such as the reconstruction of SR-92, the possible reconfiguration or removal of the Delaware/SR-92 ramp, the installation of metering lights at the 101/4th onramp, and ongoing cut-through traffic pressures. With the completion of a street grid, Delaware may become an alternate route for 101 and El Camino Real, if the proposed metering lights cause traffic back-up onto 101. As these projects move forward, they should carefully consider potential impacts on the Central Neighborhood.

Conclusions

There are several issues that contribute to residents’ concerns in the Central Neighborhood, including:

- Industrial enclaves accessible only via residential streets
- Increased development around the neighborhood
- Increased pressures for higher density infill development within the neighborhood
- Narrow residential streets that are currently classified as “collectors” or “arterials” by the City
- Low soundwall for a surrounding area that is predominantly residential

A coherent traffic calming plan may alleviate some of these problems. Chapter 3 briefly describes how traffic calming is implemented in the City of San Mateo and some of the implementation costs of various measures.

Chapter 3 Traffic Calming

The City of San Mateo City Council adopted in 2002 the *Traffic Calming Policy & Procedures*, prepared by Hexagon Transportation Consultants. According to the report, the City of San Mateo has established two categories of traffic calming measures. *Step 1* measures can be implemented on any City street and include tools such as neighborhood traffic safety campaigns, radar speed display units, targeted police enforcement, most sign installations (excluding stop signs and turn-prohibition signs) and pavement striping changes.

Step 2 measures alter the configuration of streets, impede traffic flow, change travel patterns and can be very controversial and expensive. When conducting a *Step 2* traffic calming study, it is necessary to define the area that would be affected/impacted by the installation of a *Step 2* device. There are many ways residents can be affected by a device – they could drive on that street daily, the device may be located on their street, or the device may divert traffic to their street. All residents that live on a neighborhood street within the affected area that could potentially be impacted by the installation of *Step 2* devices must be notified and participate in any *Step 2* traffic calming study. This is what is known as a “Traffic Calming Study Area.” These geographic areas are important because they become the limits of the notification area both when a study is being proposed (the petition process) and when a study is underway (the notification and survey processes). Traffic calming study areas will be defined by the Public Works Director prior to beginning the petition process.

A “Traffic Calming Study Area” can be different from a Neighborhood Association area. Typically, Neighborhood Associations are large and have many arterial and collector streets running through them. In contrast, traffic calming study areas are much smaller and typically consist of only neighborhood streets bounded by three or four arterials and/or collectors. In essence, traffic calming study areas are confined only to neighborhood streets that would be affected by the installation of *Step 2* measures. However, the size and location of the Central Neighborhood suggests that the entire neighborhood east of Delaware could be included in the Study Area.

The City of San Mateo exempts four categories of streets from *Step 2* traffic calming:

- Streets designated as “Collectors” or “Arterials” in the City of San Mateo General Plan. This includes Delaware St.
- Streets used as primary response routes for emergency vehicles,
- Streets used as bus routes, and
- Streets designated as “Truck Traffic Routes” as specified in the City Municipal Code.

Some of the Step 2 traffic calming measures that are listed in the San Mateo program are presented in Figure 4.

Figure 4 Step 2 Traffic Calming Measures

Measure	Advantages	Disadvantages	Cost
Stop Sign	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assists pedestrian crossing - Lowers speed at location - Requires traffic to stop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May increase emergency response times - Increases noise and air pollution - Increases delay at intersection 	\$200 per sign
Curb Extension , narrows a portion of the roadway by extending a portion of the curb into the street. Chokers, bulb-outs and chicanes are variants of the extension	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Shorter pedestrian crossing - Can decrease vehicle speeds - Allows better pedestrian visibility 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May require loss of on-street parking - Can create a hazard for bicyclists - Drainage can be a problem 	\$10,000 to \$20,000
Speed Hump , typically 3 inches high and 14 feet long	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effectively slows vehicles - Can result in decrease of traffic volumes - Can improve pedestrian safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Slows emergency response times - Increases noise near speed humps - Can result in traffic diversion to other streets 	\$5,000
Raised Crosswalk	- See Speed Hump Advantages	- See Speed Hump Disadvantages	\$5,000 to \$10,000
Raised Intersection	- See Speed Hump Advantages	- See Speed Hump Disadvantages	\$25,000 to \$50,000
Roundabouts & Traffic Circles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Effectively reduce vehicle speeds and potential for collision - Opportunity for landscaping - Minimal noise impact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of parking - Can disrupt access for large vehicles - High installation costs - Can increase conflicts between bicycles and automobiles 	\$25,000 to \$35,000

<p>Median Barriers, raised islands preventing certain movements at an intersection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces cut-through traffic - Opportunity for landscaping - Provides refuge area for pedestrians - Improves intersection safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - May divert traffic to other streets - High installation costs 	<p>\$5,000- \$30,000</p>
<p>Street Closures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reduces cut-through traffic - Reduces speeding - Enhances pedestrian access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Redirects traffic to other streets - Can be expensive - Increases trip lengths 	<p>\$35,000- \$50,000</p>

Source: San Mateo City Council (2002) *Traffic Calming Policy & Procedures*.

Cost of Traffic Calming Measures in Other Studies and Areas

The following section includes a brief description of the costs associated with traffic calming techniques in other areas. A more detailed description of each measure can be found in Appendix A, which is an excerpt of a Traffic Calming Toolbox that Fehr & Peers produced in association with Nelson\Nygaard for North Bernal Heights in San Francisco.

The costs described herein should be seen as estimates. As stated in ITE's publication *Traffic Calming: State of the Practice* (1999), these "estimates cannot replace detailed cost estimates using quantities and local unit prices for work items associated with specific projects. The cost of a street closure may range from a couple thousand dollars to install a guardrail to well over a hundred thousand dollars to develop a landscaped cul-de-sac. In this sense, there are no "standard" costs. Figure 5 provides sample cost estimates from the late 1990's.

Figure 5 Sample Cost Estimates for Individual Traffic Calming Measures

	Sample Cost Estimates (\$)		
	Portland, OR (1997)	Sarasota, FL (1997)	Seattle, WA (1998)
Speed humps	2,000-2,500	2,000	2,000
Speed tables	-	2,500	-
Raised intersections	-	12,500	-
Traffic circles	10,000-15,000	3,500	6,000
Chicanes	-	-	14,000
Chokers	7,000-10,000	-	-
Center islands	8,000-15,000	5,000	-
Median barriers	10,000-20,000	-	-
Half closures	40,000	-	35,000
Diagonal diverters	-	-	85,000
Full closures	-	-	120,000

Source: Ewing, Reid, *Traffic Calming: State of the Practice*, Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) for Federal Highway Administration, August 1999.

The examples in the above figure were collected in the late 1990's and do not show current and local costs for different measures. We have therefore been in contact with the City of Palo Alto and the City of Berkeley to get more recent and local information on the costs associated with traffic calming measures, traffic circles in particular, since this will be the most important measure for the Central Neighborhood. Last, we will present some cost estimates that were collected for a traffic calming plan for Bernal Heights in San Francisco.

City of Berkeley

Recent traffic calming installations in the City of Berkeley have varied significantly in costs.² Traffic circles generally cost \$30-35,000 each. The material by which Berkeley staff build temporary chokers and traffic circles is imported from Germany. The material is made of hard rubber curbing that can be bolted to the pavement and is easy to remove if the trial is proven unsuccessful. This imported material does not require marking because it has white or yellow reflective tape posted on it. The cost also includes some landscaping, where the vegetation is maintained by the neighbors, but without irrigation. The City provides the neighborhood with information on suitable plants. The traffic circles are typically 23-25 ft wide.

² Phone conversation with Ashan Kacmy, Office of Transportation, City of Berkeley, on July 14, 2005.

City experience of bulb outs is that they are also very expensive. Four bulb outs in one intersection cost around \$50,000 and up, depending on reconfiguration of storm water drainage and storage etc.

City of Palo Alto

The City of Palo Alto has recently placed speed tables in the city with an average cost of \$8-10,000. New traffic circles cost about \$10-15,000 and are built in concrete. The cost does not include landscaping, irrigation or grading.³

Bernal Heights, San Francisco

Together with a team of consultants, Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates worked from winter 2000 to March 2003 to develop a comprehensive traffic calming plan for the northern area of Bernal Heights in San Francisco. During the course of the study, the team completed several tasks, of which one was to estimate the costs of the different traffic calming measures.

The estimates in Figure 6 are shown in 2003 dollars and were developed by Reid Ewing, a traffic engineer and professor at Rutgers. Most of the numbers come from the figures provided by the San Francisco Department of Public Works (speed humps and curb extensions) and from the Caltrans price list. Certain product details were gathered from suppliers and related projects.

All bulbouts and curbwork assume no reconfiguration of storm drain inlets but do include curb cuts, pavement matching, sidewalk, trees, etc. Other costs are based on Caltrans 2001 Contract Cost Data, District 4, where applicable. Costs include Construction plus Planning (5%), Design (10%), Construction management (10%) and Traffic Routing (10%).

³ Phone conversation with Heba El-Guendy, Transportation Division, City of Palo Alto, on July 14, 2005.

Figure 6 Cost Estimates of Traffic Calming Measures in Bernal Heights, San Francisco (in 2003 dollars)

Traffic Calming Measure	Total Cost
4 bulbouts for chicanes	\$240,000
4 corner bulbouts	\$90,000
2 small bulbouts	\$30,000
1 pedestrian refuge	\$11,000
1 Speed hump	\$5,000
10 Street trees	\$4,000
Sign (Speed hump sign, Do Not Enter sign, No Parking sign)	\$225

Source: Nelson\Nygaard Consulting Associates. *North Bernal Heights Traffic Calming Project: Final Plan*, March 2003.

Chapter 4 Recommendations

Chapter 2 provided an introduction to the issues and conflicts that have arisen in the San Mateo Central Neighborhood. This chapter offers some direction for resolving those conflicts. The most important recommendations are to make the neighborhood more coherent in its land use, and to implement different traffic calming measures as well as visual improvements to the neighborhood.

A Uniform Central Neighborhood

The City of San Mateo has been one of the Bay Area's leaders in promoting Transit Oriented Development as part of its commitment to addressing the region's sprawl and traffic congestion problems. The Rail Corridor Plan and Bay Meadows Specific Plan will generate significant new development around the Hayward Park and Hillsdale Caltrain stations, producing new, mixed-use, walkable neighborhoods where many residents can walk, bike or take transit to work.

These plans, however, will also produce a significant increase in density near the Central Neighborhood, and residents are concerned that these changes will affect their quality of life. They are also concerned that success at Bay Meadows will increase pressure for more density in their neighborhood.

As already mentioned, single-family homes predominate in the Central Neighborhood, but it is zoned as R2, R3, R4 and service/commercial, allowing for higher densities than currently built. With much of the Central Neighborhood within an easy walk of the downtown San Mateo Caltrain station, planners, housing advocates, developers and traffic experts will be looking at the Central Neighborhood for more infill development opportunities. The Board of the Association is deeply concerned that poorly planned infill will reduce the quality of life there and diminish property values. Specific concerns include:

- Loss of historic single family character.
- Shift from ownership to rental housing.
- Management of parking, including increased scarcity of on-street parking, front lawns paved over for duplex parking.
- Code enforcement problems resulting from increased density, absentee land lords and inappropriate design controls.
- Increased traffic (especially heavy traffic), street cleaning and parking demand (in particular, the Association states that there is a lack of parking for businesses east and west of the neighborhood) associated with in-home businesses.

As the General Plan update process moves forward, we urge the City and the Central Neighborhood Association to work together to consider the following recommendations:



Townhomes along US-101 in Bay Meadows, San Mateo

- Rezone the industrial inholdings for townhouse residential. The industrial uses along Amphlett are only accessible by residential streets in the neighborhood, resulting in truck traffic complaints. By replacing these uses with a row of townhomes, similar to those along Waynes Way at 101 and Hillsdale as part of the Bay Meadows project, the trucks can be eliminated, additional housing can be provided, and some of the freeway noise can be deflected from the neighborhood.
- Set a moratorium on new multifamily development in the single-family home blocks of the Central Neighborhood and work to create a Neighborhood Specific Plan. The topic of infill development is a sensitive one. Neighborhoods elsewhere in San Mateo have agreed to receive extra development, but they have received new parks, improved streets and other amenities as part of the package. The Central Neighborhood is justified in its desire to be rezoned primarily as R1, or R2 where already implemented, so long as the problems listed elsewhere in this paper persist. A community based planning process, similar to but smaller in scale than that used for Bay Meadows, will help the Central Neighborhood come to consensus on the appropriate level of density for its various streets, as well as the trade-offs associated with more development or more neighborhood amenities.

Traffic Calming

There are currently 4-way stop signs in a majority of the intersections in the Central Neighborhood. These have likely helped to reduce the number of traffic accidents in the neighborhood by half, by forcing the motorists to stop at each intersection before moving on. However, 4-way stop signs can cause delays in traffic and may also result in speeding between the stop signs.

With increased traffic flows from potential developments in the Corridor Plan Area and in other areas, the stop signs may need to be replaced by other traffic calming measures, such as traffic circles (without stop signs or possibly with two stop signs), speed humps and chicanes.

Nelson\Nygaard suggests that the Central Neighborhood Association in cooperation with the Public Works department at the City of San Mateo produce both a short-term and a long-term plan for the neighborhood. Nelson\Nygaard will come with recommendations in this chapter. However, for the traffic calming plan to be implemented, it needs consensus from both the residents and the City. An important step to achieve consensus is the creation of a Neighborhood Communication

Plan. Chapter 5 briefly describes how this can be accomplished. The Central Neighborhood has also been through this process before and may have additional actions that will further enhance the Communication Plan.

5th and 9th Avenue

Nelson\Nygaard's recommendation for the Central Neighborhood is to install traffic circles in the following intersections along 5th and 9th Avenue:

- Eldorado St (currently temporary traffic circle at 5th and Eldorado)
- Fremont St
- Grant St (currently a collector street, must therefore be reclassified as a local street)
- Humboldt St (currently an arterial, must therefore be reclassified as a local street).
- Idaho St

Humboldt St is an arterial from the border of Burlingame all the way to its dead end at 10th Avenue. It is currently serving the truck traffic between S Amphlett and 3rd/4th Avenues. Our long-term solution is to replace the industrial land use with residential, for instance townhomes as described above and shown in the photo on the right. If this can be accomplished, there is no need for Humboldt to be an arterial or 9th Avenue to be a collector. This would enable implementation of traffic circles along both 9th Avenue and 5th Avenue.



9th Avenue looking west from S Amphlett



Townhomes in Bay Meadows, San Mateo

Grant Street

Grant St is a collector street between 3rd Avenue and 19th Avenue. It is important that this street becomes a subject of traffic calming to reduce the potential through-traffic from the Corridor Plan Developments. It must therefore be reclassified to a local street. Recommended measures are speed humps and chicanes, in addition to the two traffic circles along 5th and 9th Avenue.

Humboldt Street

An even more aggressive solution is to reclassify Humboldt as soon as possible, and force all truck traffic from Amphlett on to 9th Avenue and Delaware St, where they can connect with SR-92 and US-101. This would alleviate Humboldt St north of 9th Avenue and the intersections at 3rd and 4th Avenues. However, the impacts of this reclassification need to be investigated by the City of San Mateo.

Traffic Circle at 5th Avenue and Eldorado St

The traffic circle at 5th Avenue and Eldorado St has been in place for several years, but was designed as a temporary circle. It needs to be upgraded to a permanent circle and the 4-way stop signs need to be removed. The major difference between a traffic circle and a 4-way stop is that the circle enables traffic to flow in a steady pace, instead of forcing

each vehicle entering the intersection to come to a full stop. We recommend that all traffic circles that are implemented in the neighborhood be installed without stop signs. These traffic circles can be landscaped with irrigation, but will then be very expensive, compared to having the right types of plants and trees that can be maintained by the neighbors without too much effort. Drought tolerant plants such as Fortnight Lilies and Lilies of the Nile are good alternatives. The neighborhood could also look further into working with local landscaping companies in exchange for free advertising for on-going maintenance assistance.

Claremont and Idaho Streets

Claremont and Idaho Streets have had about twice as many accidents as the other north-south bound streets in the neighborhood (except Delaware St) over the past three years. They should therefore be subject of additional traffic calming measures such as chicanes and/or speed humps.

7th Avenue

7th Avenue is much narrower than 5th and 9th Avenues and currently carries much fewer vehicles than the parallel streets. It is important that the proposed traffic calming measures along 5th and 9th Avenues do not push all the traffic onto 7th Avenue. We therefore recommend keeping the stop signs in the east-west direction between Eldorado St and Idaho St.



7th Avenue looking west from S Amphlett

Walking and Bicycling Environment

The Central Neighborhood is a beautiful area with a rich variety in architectural styles. The neighborhood can become even more attractive with monuments placed at the entrances of the neighborhood, and if the concrete strips between the sidewalk and the roadway are landscaped. In addition, several of the streets are either bicycle routes or are striped with bicycle lanes. It is therefore important, both for safety, security and attractiveness that the entire neighborhood is equipped with street lamps.

Raised Soundwall Along Freeway

With the current land use along S Amphlett it is not feasible to raise the soundwall along US-101, due to the existing tenants' right to be visible from the freeway. However, if the area is redeveloped, Caltrans should conduct a neighborhood screening to determine whether or not freeway noise exceeds the State of California's 67 decibel level threshold. If it does, the soundwall along this stretch of the freeway should be raised consistent with the adjacent soundwalls.

Chapter 5 Neighborhood Communication Plan

A key ingredient for a plan’s successful implementation is achieving consensus among neighborhood residents throughout the project from the development of goals and priorities to the selection of preferred recommendations.

In addition to providing valuable information, public meetings also help to develop a negotiated phasing strategy for project implementation. For example, some residents may be concerned that traffic calming on one street would simply push the problem to another street. In order to address this critical concern, a phased implementation approach should be developed. If at any point it becomes clear that the traffic calming efforts result in a significant shift in speeding and cut-through to a parallel street, the City should be committed to alleviating the problem through increased measures on the “receiving” street or decreased measures on the “exporting” street.

The following chart summarizes how consensus can be achieved:

Task	Goal	Results
Neighborhood Survey and Newsletter 1	Introduce project, invite to Workshop 1.	Strong guidance on key streets to be addressed and key problems to be solved.
Data Collection	Collect additional data, if necessary.	Data corresponds with community survey.
Workshop 1	Present primary data, introduce traffic calming concepts.	High degree of consensus achieved on priorities.
Form Working Group	Get dedicated group of individuals to represent their sub-neighborhoods through project.	Working Group represents full breadth of the neighborhood.
Present Survey Results and Data to Working Group	Present data and interpret.	Clear priorities agreed upon by Working Group.
Working Group Meetings on Toolbox	Introduce Working Group to traffic calming toolbox and describe applicability in neighborhood.	High degree of consensus achieved on priorities and best devices for specific locations.
Local Sub-Area Group Meetings	Introduce more residents to the process and get input on detailed street-by-street issues.	Preliminary recommendations may be revised based upon residents’ input.
Newsletter 2	Present data and welcome to Workshop 2.	Sent to all residents.
Workshop 2	Present preliminary findings on most applicable traffic calming devices to address project priorities, and get feedback.	Neighborhood fully supported core concepts, set priorities for implementation and added helpful concerns to be addressed.

Task	Goal	Results
Develop Draft Traffic Calming Plan	Compile input from data sources, Working Group and two Workshops, develop draft traffic calming plan.	Working Group agrees to all core concepts and revises implementation strategy to address concern.
Newsletter 3	Focus on preliminary traffic calming plan for neighborhood.	Sent to residents.
Workshop 3	Present Final Draft Plan including detailed implementation priorities, get input from community.	Residents confirm recommendations and suggest further refinements to phasing and implementation details. A single alternative is agreed upon.
Finalize Plan	Prepare Final Traffic Calming Plan.	
Newsletter 4	Present Final Plan to community.	