

Morgan Hill Transportation Master Plan

Stakeholders Meeting #4

Wednesday April 17th, 2024

City Hall

Meeting Summary

Meeting Attendees:

Stakeholders in Attendance

Name	Organization
Krista Rupp	Visit Morgan Hill
Doug Muirhead	
Jake Thompson	
Maureen Tobin	
John Moniz	Parks and Rec Commission
Dana Haberland	Senior Center Transportation Committee
Joe Mueller	Planning Commission
Larissa Sanderfer	

Stakeholders not in Attendance:

Name	Organization
Joe Baranowski	Responsible Growth Coalition
Nick Gaich	Chamber of Commerce
Wayne Tanda	Planning Commission
Matthew Lundy	
Elizabeth Schaus	
Doug Hall	
Catherine Ferris	
Claire Francis	
Adam Bradford	
Sofia Ruiz-McGinty	Youth Action Council
Elizabeth Munoz-Rosas	MHUSD Parent
John McKay	
Armando Benevidas	
Arjun Narayanan	Youth Action Council
Patricia Darling	
Chrystal Silva-Davis	Morgan Hill Unified School District

Agency Staff Attendees: City of Morgan Hill: Chris Ghione, Jennifer Carman, Maria Angeles, Adam Paszkowski, Nicole Martin, Nolan Ugalde, Captain Ray Ramos

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

Other Attendees: None

Meeting Summary:

Refreshments were provided at the meeting.

The meeting followed the following agenda:

- **Welcome, Review of Agenda, Role of the Stakeholder Group, and Introductions**
- **Where we are in the TMP Process**
- **Recap of Previous Meeting**
- **Multimodal Street Typologies**
- **TMP Improvement Tool Box**
- **Prioritization Criteria**
- **Work/Group Exercise**
 - TMP Goals
 - Group Report Out
 - Prioritization Criteria Ranking and Weighting
 - Group Report Out
 - Reviewing Street Typologies and Applying Tool Box improvements to maps
 - Group Report Out
- **Next Meeting Dates-6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.**
 - Wednesday July 31st (Tentative)
- **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 by promoting upcoming community meetings and city committee and council meetings to their networks.

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 the next meeting date is tentatively set for July 31st. The meeting will be from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. in the same location as this evening's meeting. The topics would include a draft set of goals, actions and policies and a funding discussion.

Eileen and Robert explained the three workshop sessions for input later in the meeting one on goals, one on improvement prioritization criteria and one utilizing the maps and types of projects that might be implemented. Robert explained the process for each session and what the team was hoping to have specific stakeholder input on.

Robert, utilizing PowerPoint slides, explained where we are in the TMP process and summarized the input received at and after the last meeting.

He highlighted group feedback suggesting street typologies for certain Morgan Hill roadways and feedback prioritizing roadway right-of-way for:

- #1 Better pedestrian facilities through wider sidewalks, safer crossings, and better connectivity
- #2: Providing more bike lanes and where possible, buffered or protected bike lanes
- #3: Keeping travel lanes

Ellie presented color coded maps showing the suggested typologies for Morgan Hill streets. She explained the maps would be part of one of the workshop sessions later in the meeting. She also reviewed the various street widths using cross sections and elements they could potentially support as rural roads, main streets, boulevards and community corridors.

Specific feedback and questions on the typologies included:

- Are there “best practices for certain street widths and elements within those widths such as lanes? (Yes)
- How do Morgan Hill streets fit those best practices now? (Pretty well, there are existing bike facilities and such. In other places there is no ability to secure additional right-of-way due to proximity of buildings so in some places solutions may be less than ideal)
- How much more work to get to best practices? (There could be quite a bit as there are gaps in bike lanes, places where lanes are not buffered, etc.)
- What about landscaping and aesthetics and heat island effects? (Landscaping to provide shade is part of the “tool box” we will be touching on next)
- Monterey Road is a good example of a road that changes context throughout the city, and it involves a Project Development Area designation as well as existing form-based coding on file. How does that fit with the boulevard designation? (All of that is part of the process and will be considered)
- Will this effort develop a checklist for development? (No, that is not anticipated)
- I want these plans to be implementable. (Comment noted)

Shika and Ellie presented types of projects that could address bike and pedestrian issues, placemaking, vehicle operations, traffic calming and regional cut-through traffic.

- Can we add additional ideas? (Yes)

Robert gave a presentation highlighting the criteria that would be used to screen and prioritize projects suggested by the TMP. He stressed that safety is the number one criterion and would be part of any project developed. He also explained that criteria would be developed that would consider and prioritize community considerations and also additional criteria that address engineering and city staff concerns such as cost to value ratios.

- There were no questions or comments related to this item.

The group was asked to spend time at their tables discussing and potentially editing the goals for the TMP. These goals were discussed at the prior meeting and definitions of these goals were sent ahead of this meeting as “homework” for the group to prepare them for this discussion. The draft TMP Goals are: Safety; Increased Transportation Operations; Access to Regional Transit Service and Local Destinations; and Congestion Management.

The groups were asked to focus on two or three big ideas from their discussions.

First group to speak:

- Vision zero should be added to safety and projects should be forced to mitigate for safety even during construction such as placement of temporary fences that can impede pedestrians.
- If education programs are to be used, then the city should come up with a way to measure the results so they can see if efforts are working.
- Monterey Road deserves a marketing effort to slow speeders and change behavior.

The second group to speak focused on:

- Goal #4 and the impacts of cut through travel on the east side of town especially and it impacts all residents.
- The impact of waze and google maps on sending people through town when they are on regional routes.
- The need for strategies for cut-through traffic.

The next activity was for the two groups to use twenty marbles and six jars to rank and prioritize by weight the criteria. Safety was not a separate jar because it is always the top criteria and there was a blank jar to add new criteria if the group chose to do that.

The first group to report out (second team to report above) had the following ranking and weighting:

- Pedestrian safety, comfort, and connectivity (5)
- Vehicle operations (4)
- Bicycle safety, comfort, and connectivity (5)
- Access to key destinations (5)
- Equity (0)
- Regional cut-through (1)

The second group to report out (first team to report above) had the following ranking and weighting:

- Pedestrian safety, comfort, and connectivity (6)
- Regional cut-through (5)
- Vehicle operations (4)
- Bicycle safety, comfort, and connectivity (4)
- Access to key destinations (1)
- Equity (0)

There were no new criteria added by either group. Equity was not weighted by either group. The project team added up the jars to create final counts.

- A stakeholder commented that under vehicle operations category bicycle signal time should be considered as the modes are all connected.

The final workshop item was to take the city maps and suggest edits to the draft typologies shown for the streets and begin the place ideas for capital projects at intersections or along corridors.

The first group to report out (same as the first for the second activity) had the following observations:

- No typology changes for the streets.
- The group highlighted areas for traffic calming.
- Traffic calming is desired at schools.
- Hill Road is an important community corridor.
- East Dunne between Hill Road and Gallop Drive has excess right-of-way and could be made into a linear park. This linear park treatment could also apply to Watsonville Road and Llagas Road.

The second group to report out (same as the second group for the second activity) had the following observations:

- Northside of town has many pedestrian and bicycle network gaps that should be closed.
- Sobrato High School has a need for a pedestrian crosswalk to cross Burnett Avenue.
- There is a need for pedestrian crossings near the sports complex.
- There is a need to link pedestrian walkways on the east side of Monterey Road to users of the Community Park.
- Watsonville Road is straight and wide needs pedestrian crossing at trails and there should be roundabouts at intersections.

Eileen closed out the meeting highlighting the next steps and the upcoming meetings related to the project. She explained that stakeholders were welcome to attend these and support the project.

Draft Goals, Strategies, & Actions taken to:

Planning Commission May 14th at 7 p.m.

Parks & Recreation Commission May 21st at 7 p.m.

City Council May 16th at 6 p.m.

Planned Stakeholder Meeting #5 — Tentatively Scheduled July 31st

Identification of TMP Improvement Funding – July-August

Identification of selected TMP Improvements & Strategies/Actions – July-August

Community Meeting - August/September

Draft TMP Plan – Fall

Action Items/future agenda items:

- Additional input from stakeholders is encouraged and stakeholders are asked to return the comments by April 24rd.
- Next Stakeholder Committee meeting July 31st (tentative),

Meeting summary prepared by Eileen Goodwin, Apex Strategies.