

## **Morgan Hill Transportation Master Plan**

### **Stakeholders Meeting #2**

**Wednesday December 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023**

**City Hall West Conference Room**

### **Meeting Summary**

#### **Meeting Attendees:**

#### **Stakeholders in Attendance**

Name	Organization
Doug Muirhead	
Jake Thompson	
Elizabeth Schaus	
Joe Baranowski	Responsible Growth Coalition
Nick Gaich	Chamber of Commerce
John Moniz	Parks and Rec Commission
Dana Haberland	Senior Center Transportation Committee
Joe Mueller	Planning Commission
Wayne Tanda	Planning Commission
Adam Bradford	
Matthew Lundy	
Larissa Sanderfer	
Armando Benevidas	
Maureen Tobin	

#### **Stakeholders not in Attendance:**

Name	Organization
Krista Rupp	Visit Morgan Hill
Doug Hall	
Catherine Ferris	
Claire Francis	
Adam Bradford	
Sofia Ruiz-McGinty	Youth Action Council
Elizabeth Munoz-Rosas	MHUSD Parent
John McKay	
Arjun Narayanan	Youth Action Council
Patricia Darling	
Chrystal Silva-Davis	Morgan Hill Unified School District

**Agency Staff Attendees:** City of Morgan Hill: Chris Ghione, Edith Ramirez, Jennifer Carman, Maria Angeles, Adam Paszkowski, VTA: Larissa Sandafer

**Consultant Project Team Staff Attendees:** Robert Del Rio Hexagon Project Manager, and Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies

**Meeting Summary:**

Chris Ghione convened the meeting on behalf of the city, he thanked and welcomed the members of the Community Stakeholders group for the Transportation Master Plan effort (TMP).

Refreshments were provided at the meeting.

The meeting followed the following agenda:

- **Welcome, Review of Agenda, and Introductions**
- **Re-cap of Public Outreach Activities and City Council and Committee input**
  - Feedback Themes
- **Presentation of Survey Results**
  - Individual Stakeholder Feedback on Survey Results
  - What is Your Biggest Take-away from survey information presented?
  - What is your biggest surprise in the survey results?
  - What do you believe are the implications from these results on any solutions and policies for the TMP Team?
  - Facilitator and Group to Identify Themes
- **Presentation of Cut-Through Traffic Study Results**
- **Small Group Discussion and Report Out of Cut-Through Traffic Study Results**
  - Cut-through information—Observations?
  - What about origins and destinations information from the outreach meetings? Anything to add or enhance?
  - Group Report Out
  - Facilitator and Group Identification of Themes
- **Next Meeting Dates-6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.**
  - Wednesday, February 28th
  - Wednesday July 31st
- **Next Steps, Action Items and Adjourn**

Eileen reviewed the agenda. She stated the purpose of the Stakeholder Committee by utilizing the following points:

- Build community knowledge about the project and project process.
- Hear perspectives from a range of community members.
- Incorporate community ideas, needs and preferences into the

- Transportation Master Plan (where appropriate and feasible)
- Develop community support for proposed TMP.

Eileen also highlighted the role of the members as ambassadors for the effort. She mentioned the team's hope that members will help the city get the word out about future community input opportunities. She also stressed the desire to learn from each member's expertise and experience and that the Committee is a forum for collaboration. She highlighted the Committee would function by stressing the following points:

- The Committee is advisory to the city's staff and does not make final decisions on the project.
- The Committee will run by consensus with the assistance of a facilitator.
- Committee members shall not speak on behalf of the Committee or the City
- The City Council is the ultimate policy maker relating to any policies or prioritization of the projects for the City.

Eileen explained that this evening's meeting would be auto focused and that the next stakeholder meeting in February would focus on bicycle, pedestrian and transit elements.

She mentioned the next two stakeholder meeting dates have been chosen. They are February 28<sup>th</sup> and July 31<sup>st</sup>. Both meetings will be from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. and will likely be held in the Council Chambers.

She then reviewed the community input themes from the lightly attended community meetings in November. She highlighted that the input received at the stations was similar between the English language community meeting and the one held in Spanish.

Committee stakeholders had the following questions:

- Why the "fire evacuation topic" was not highlighted in the review of themes? (Because it was not highlighted as many times as other topics. The topic was captured in the meeting summary for the meeting)

Robert recapped the on-line survey results which included 521 responses. The survey was in both English and Spanish. Only one person took the survey in Spanish.

He stressed the following take-aways from the survey:

- Approximately half the respondents are aged 55 and above.
- 40 percent of the respondents commute outside Morgan Hill for work/school.
- 87% of respondents drive alone. One-third would consider using transit if cost and time were equivalent to driving.
- Primary transportation concerns include traffic congestion, US 101 cut-through traffic, speeding, and walking/biking safety.
- Less than 50 percent of respondents regularly walk or ride a bike.
- Improved safety and connectivity would encourage biking and walking.

- Less than 10 percent of the respondents currently use transit in Morgan Hill.
- Frequency and lack of service are primary reasons for not using transit.
- The primary focus of the transportation improvements should be to reduce congestion, expand walking and biking opportunities, reduce vehicle speeds, police enforcement, and improved transit opportunities.

The community stakeholders asked the following questions and made the following observations on the outreach activities and the TMP more broadly:

- Would it be possible to see male/female breakdown by answer? (No, the respondents' sex was not asked, due to number of questions already being asked.)
- How many responses are really families responding versus individuals? (No way to know this.)
- How to increase responses beyond 1-2% of the city residents? Can we re-open the survey? (521 responses is a very good response rate, there will be another survey once the suggestions are formulated stakeholders can help get the work out then and city staff will also promote the survey more through additional channels.)
- What percentage of the city population is 55 and older? (One quarter of the population of Morgan Hill is 55 and older, one quarter is 18 and younger.)

The members were asked to respond to three questions by writing their personal observations on sticky notes and placing them up on the sheets for each question. The three questions were:

- What is Your Biggest Take-away from survey information presented?
- What is your biggest surprise in the survey results?
- What do you believe are the implications from these results on any solutions and policies for the TMP Team?

Eileen then read each response and made observations about the themes or lack of themes in the responses.

These are the transcribed notes organized by question:

### **Question 1: Biggest Takeaway**

People continue to think that congestion is due to housing.

People are concerned about congestion.

101 congestion what respondents thought the source is.

Lack of responses from the “under 55” age group: What social media was targeted? QR codes in public areas? Restaurants?

The respondents really care about congestion and growth limits. This is at odds with state law.

Not surprised with the results.

Need to enhance transit access/availability/frequency. Need to engage/activate safe walking points/lanes. Need to increase MoGo services.

Fewer people leaving Morgan Hill. Congestion mitigation projects are priority.

#1 Takeaway: Heavy orientation toward vehicles. Low level of walk/bike/transit.

Traffic calming on residential street is a concern.

Safety. No inclusion for emergency evacuation routes – fire, earthquake, flood, medical

We have a good representation of the population's concerns in this room.

Addressing minimal shoulder areas on undeveloped streets priority.

66% of respondents are employed and 39% work outside Morgan Hill. I believed the percentage of those that drive outside of MH to work would be higher.

## **Question 2: Biggest Surprise**

Survey not representative of the population, with 50% over the age of 55.

Biggest surprise: None

Speed: No information about where.

That 55 plus do not currently bike in MH. Low reports of biking as a transportation mode, yet high on the list as a primary improvement.

Just exclusively car-dependent the town is. I knew cars rule MH, but I didn't think it was the essentially only mode. Extreme lack of walking and biking.

That 28%, or 3 out of 10 respondents, are retired. Normally avoid traveling during peak periods.

Number of residents willing to bike/other than auto transport.

Surprise: 39% travel outside of MH. Thought that would be higher.

Transportation (78%) was the primary concern vs. 101 cut-through at 56%.

No surprise – results what I expected.

Biggest surprise: 50% of respondents were over 55 years of age.

The talk about speed concerns – we took speed bumps off downtown Monterey and people seemed happy about that.

Low number of respondents under 55.

In spite of many city statements in recent years 50% blame growth for congestion and 50% want to limit growth as solution.

Lack of concern by younger residents. Emphasis on other modes of transport – biking, intercity transit.

### **Question 3: Implications for TMP Team**

Education the community on what the congestion caused by.

We need new ways to limit congestion. Can't legally limit growth; so, recommend changing growth: High density housing, better biking, walking and transit. Seems like only option.

Impact – a lot of work needs to be done to encourage other transportation modes.

Development growth seems to be the blame (valid or not) for most transportation issues.

Effort requires a comprehensive/targeted solution. Not a Single Fix!

Focus on more transit capabilities. Get more from State roads.

Likely people don't realize they will be hindered in some way when something gets put in place.

Where do we find the money to resolve is the bigger issue.

Focus on congestion. I do NOT understand why survey data or more "participation" should be a concern. Congestion is an engineering problem.

Need significant changes – physical and mindset to move forward. Almost overwhelming.

Need heavy involvement in education and infrastructure for non-auto modes.

I think our focus syncs with respondents.

Robert reviewed the regional cut-through analysis study. He stressed the focus was regional traffic cut through related to US 101 not neighborhood traffic cut through related to schools and the like. He explained the study methodology, including why the data was from spring 2022, and highlighted some observations. Those take-aways include:

- Regional cut-through traffic on city roadways peaks when US 101 is the most congested, which happens during the peak commute periods.
- AM peak commute period has a higher percent of cut-through traffic compared to the PM peak commute period.
- Study roadway segments that have a high percentage of regional cut-through traffic are along Dunne Avenue, Butterfield Boulevard, Wright Avenue, Hale Avenue, Tennant Avenue, and Monterey Road.

- The most utilized route for the northbound regional traffic during AM commute period is Butterfield Boulevard.
- The most utilized routes for the southbound regional traffic during PM commute period are Monterey Road and Butterfield Boulevard.

The community stakeholders had the following questions:

- How does this issue fit into the TMP effort? (This is important context for the work of the TMP)
- What is the timeframe for the additional lane on US 101? (Unknown, likely a decade out.)
- How to communicate this information to the community? Is this going to be available? (There is a project website and the materials shared at these meetings and the public meetings are posted on-line and available to the public.)

The stakeholders were asked to work in groups and answer the following questions:

- Cut-through information—Observations?
- What about origins and destinations, information from the outreach meetings? Anything to add or enhance?

The stakeholders were asked not to “solve issues” but instead reflect on the data presented and its implications.

The information boards with the community input notes were placed around the room for reference. Stakeholders were also encouraged to add their own input if they had not participated in the community meeting. After about twenty minutes of discussion, the groups reported the following observations:

Group 1:

- Surprised about 40% of cut through traffic in the a.m.
- Surprised about Santa Teresa traffic from Bailey in p.m.
- Surprised about the eastside cut through traffic in the a.m., not following signs.
- Surprised that 26% of p.m. traffic is mainly residents.
- Monterey was not one of the main arteries as a cut through –which it was expected to be.
- Can completely stop MH growth and MH would still get almost the exact same amount of traffic so doesn’t change outcome.
- More lanes on US 101 does not support a decrease in traffic.
- Report shows us which roads to focus on to target cut-throughs.
- Not addressing key points now will create larger issues.
- Origin/destination input:
  - Doctor offices and medical offices/facilities
  - DePaul renovation and services
  - Parks and trails
  - Industrial campuses

Group 2:

- Congestion and speed are often related as people don't want to miss out;
- Surprised by the impact of regional growth on traffic patterns compared to what Morgan Hill can control and its growth which has a very small impact on congestion and cut through;
- Housing growth impacts, feel that the city is "stuck in the middle" of jobs to the north and housing to the south;
- Cut through happens on holidays, nights and weekends as well and is likely driven by apps people use showing alternatives to staying on US 101;

Group 3:

- What do we care about holistically, we should document;
- Hale extension implications and impacts—is it a feeder to more cut through?
- Implications of US 101 HOV lanes? What happens when EVs are no longer eligible for HOV lanes?
- What are traffic volumes on local roads in am/pm?
- What are assumptions about 101?
- What are assumptions about enhanced rail service to Gilroy?
- What are implications of reinstating rail service from Salinas to San Jose?
- Relationship of MH job growth to traffic?
- What is the impact of industrial sites on traffic?  
What are the implications of all of this on MH and what are we going to do about it?

**Action Items/future agenda items:**

- Next Stakeholder Committee meeting February 28<sup>th</sup> 2024 at City Council Chambers at 6:00p.m. to discuss bike, pedestrian and transit issues.
- Stakeholder Meeting July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2024 will focus on solutions and policy ideas.

Meeting summary prepared by Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies.