

Morgan Hill Transportation Master Plan

Stakeholders Meeting #3

Wednesday March 27th, 2024

City Hall

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendees:

Stakeholders in Attendance

Name	Organization
Krista Rupp	Visit Morgan Hill
Doug Muirhead	
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
Matthew Lundy	
Armando Benevidas	

Stakeholders not in Attendance:

Name	Organization
Jake Thompson	
Elizabeth Schaus	
Doug Hall	
Catherine Ferris	
Claire Francis	
Adam Bradford	
Sofia Ruiz-McGinty	Youth Action Council
Elizabeth Munoz-Rosas	MHUSD Parent
John McKay	
Maureen Tobin	
Larissa Sanderfer	
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, Nicole Martin, Nolan Ugalde

Consultant Project Team Staff Attendees: Robert Del Rio Hexagon, Project Manager, Shika Jain, Hexagon, Deputy Project Manager Aaron Sussman, Toole Design, Principal Planner, Ellie Gertler, Toole Design, Planner, and Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies, Facilitator.

Other Attendees: Three high school seniors attended the meeting for an hour each for class credit. Jim Moskus.

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, Role of the Stakeholder Group, and Introductions**
- **Overview of TMP Goals**
- **Multimodal Analysis**
 - Bicycle/Pedestrian Network (Existing/Gaps)
 - Bicycle/Pedestrian Safety Analysis (Hot Spots)
- **Traffic Operations Analysis**
 - Transportation Demand Model
 - VTA Model and Structure
 - City-specific Land Use Data
 - Traffic Operations
 - Intersection Peak Hour Operations
 - Roadway Segment Capacity Analysis
- **Work/Group Exercise**
 - Street Typologies, Definitions, Introduction to Activity
 - Allocation of Roadway Space exercise
 - Group Report Out
- **Next Meeting Dates-6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.**
 - Wednesday, April 17th
 - 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.

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 focused on bicycle and pedestrian elements primarily. She mentioned that the Team added an additional Stakeholder Group Meeting due to the amount of information and desire for community feedback, she mentioned the next two stakeholder meeting dates have been chosen. They are April 17th and July 31st. Both meetings will be from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. in the same location as this evening's meeting.

Chris Ghione presented the draft TMP Goals: Safety; Increased Transportation Operations; Access to Regional Transit Service and Local Destinations; and Congestion Management. Stakeholders were encouraged to review the draft language and come prepared for a discussion at the next meeting. There were no comments from the stakeholders on this item.

Aaron Sussman utilized a series of map slides to explain the pedestrian priority zones. He explained that the zones would be used to help prioritize needed improvements such as where new crossings were needed; enhancements to existing crossings; and address sidewalk gaps.

Ellie Gertler made a similar presentation with maps to explain the Bikeways and Trailways Network. She explained that this network information would be used to prioritize areas for improvements. She further explained that the information identified areas where there are gaps; areas of high traffic stress for users; and opportunities to increase separation of bike users from motor vehicles. She indicated the process would culminate with an updated set of priorities for bike and trailway projects.

Aaron reviewed the high injury network and safety issues with the group using a set of maps. He explained this effort would culminate with a set of prioritized improvements that would inform the upcoming Safety Action Plan effort.

The stakeholders had the following comments and questions on the three presentations:

- What can be done to make Llagas Road safer? (Speed management, signage, separation are all tools that can be used)
- If safety is the goal, how can we measure that? (Crashes and near misses)
- How do the Morgan Hill streets rate compare to peers on safety? (We can bring some analysis to the April meeting)
- Currently there are three ways to get data on street safety but they don't really measure near misses. How do we capture that? (We have predictive tools so we can predict given street typologies how near misses may occur due to speed, street design, and traffic volumes)
- What transportation grants has the city received? Tell us more about the Safety Action Plan and other efforts. (Morgan Hill has several grants underway including one focused on Monterey Corridor, the Safety Action Plan is about to start, and a sidewalk assessment they will all help inform the TMP and vice versa).
- This is very rich data. How can we make it digestible for the lay person? How will we speak to the community about this and prioritize this information and projects? (We will be diving into criteria and prioritization at the next meeting.)

Robert reviewed the regional traffic model that VTA utilizes and a city specific land use model that takes into account planned and foreseen growth including pending (pipeline) development. He utilized an example of a single Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) within Morgan Hill to show how the model inputs work. He shared model results of current 2023 intersection operations in Morgan Hill compared to forecasted 2050 model results for the same intersections. He also compared roadway segment capacity for the same two timeframes. Robert shared a table that showed intersection and traffic segment operation changes over time by percentage. He also gave a comparison of congestion comparisons to four peer jurisdictions for General Plan Buildout Conditions.

The community stakeholders asked the following questions and made the following observations on this item:

- Does the analysis assume new roadway improvements? (Yes, it assumes build out as detailed in the memo provided)
- Does it show 2023 plus build out plus growth? (Yes, there are several scenarios that are analyzed)
- Does it show where things break down? May I get this data? (Yes, we can make that available so you can see where and when things break down.)
- To confirm, there is approved projects plus pipeline projects in the model? (Yes)
- Does this data also have bike data or is it just vehicles? (This operations data is just about vehicles. But the model does break it down by mode. The model is based on person trips and assigns modes.)

Aaron presented information on the city's street typologies: Boulevard, Community Corridor, Main Street, Neighborhood Street and Rural Street. Stakeholders were asked to decide how differing roadway widths should be allocated between vehicles, pedestrians, bicyclists, car parking, landscaping, bus pull outs, and lighting. Two types of streets typology base maps were provided, one for a generic boulevard and one for a generic community corridor condition. Groups were given game pieces of to scale layouts of traffic lanes at various widths, types of bike lanes, various sidewalk widths, and other elements to mix and match as appropriate. The groups were given approximately twenty minutes for their street building and then there was a ten-minute report out for the two groups.

The following priorities and observations were made by each group:

Group One:

Community Corridor: Used buffered bike lanes, lots of landscaping, higher protection for pedestrians and bikes, looked at travel lane widths for cars but it was a trade off with beautification which the group wanted. Group One wanted a landscaped median. Safety was most important. Used a bus shelter piece.

Boulevard: Ran out of time to finish but made progress with wanting to keep traffic moving, landscaping on the left side only. Provided a two-way bike path. Group One felt two-way bike path would be more effective use of space. Reduced sidewalk width to 6' from 8' to keep traffic moving. No bus shelter was utilized because it took up too much space.

Group Two:

Community Corridor: Wanted to slow traffic down so chose 10' lanes instead of 12' lanes but it was pointed out that 10' lanes may not be safe due to the number of large SUV's in Morgan Hill. The 10' lanes would be a challenge for SUV's. Chose bike lanes on each side of the road. Tried to accommodate parking. When asked by the other group, this group indicated that bus shelters would be appropriate although they hadn't provided them.

Boulevard: Higher speed necessitated more protection for bikes. The group didn't like center turn lanes so wanted landscaping instead.

After the activity the stakeholders indicated that the exercise was effective in demonstrating the trade-off between modes and amenities. In addition, stakeholders were also given comment cards that asked for individual input related to the group exercise. Participants were asked to suggest typologies for up to three Morgan Hill Streets by name and participants were asked to provide up to three suggestion priorities in the ways to lay out local streets. Many people provided feedback at the meeting. Some members asked for the card to be sent electronically so they could fill it out and

send it back in after further consideration. Chris agreed to make it available and asked for the comment cards back by April 3rd.

Action Items/future agenda items:

- Benchmark Morgan Hill Street safety against peers for April meeting.
- Chris to distribute Comment Card to stakeholders and stakeholders are asked to return the comments by April 3rd.
- Data to be made available to those who want to look into it further, by individual request through Chris Ghione.
- Next Stakeholder Committee meeting April 17th, 2024 at City Council Chambers at 6:00 p.m. to discuss goals, draft policies, TMP Improvement tools, prioritization criteria, and funding availability.
- Stakeholder Meeting July 31st, 2024 will focus on solutions and policy ideas and the Draft TMP document.

Meeting summary prepared by Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies.