

Transportation Actions by GMP Alternative (not including trail connections)

Current Condition/ No-Action Alternative		Alternative 1: Connecting People	Alternative 2: Coastal Ecosystems	Alternative 3: National Treasures
Muir Woods				
Arrival <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...supporting public transportation as a way to reduce congestion Today, most visitors arrive by personal vehicles and commercial tour buses. Since 2005 a pilot shuttle service has been used during the summer to help reduce traffic congestion. Current parking areas are located adjacent to Redwood Creek and very near the main concentration of redwoods. The entrance area is located at the edge of the redwood forest adjacent to Redwood Creek. It includes a parking area, restrooms, and a small visitor information station with a book store and fee collection booth. This area is a hub of activity with a mix of pedestrians, automobiles, and buses. Additional parking areas are further down along Redwood Creek. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A shuttle system, with parking and basic visitor services off-site, would be an important first point for orientation and key to sustainable access. To enhance the visitor experience and address congestion problems, permanent shuttle service to Muir Woods would be provided, supported by new welcome centers at Muir Woods and in the vicinity of Highway 1/Interstate 101. The welcome centers would provide orientation, information, restrooms, snacks, picnicking facilities, and a book store; the centers would connect the shuttle to regional and local transportation systems. Parking would be provided at the off-site welcome center; parking retained at the Monument to serve visitors during non-peak times would be modified to reduce impacts to sensitive resources. <p>The existing entry road and entry area would be redesigned to enhance the arrival experience and improve safety. The existing parking closest to the entrance area (the upper lot) would be removed and the meadow would be restored to create a more natural arrival.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...the majority of the built environment – buildings, parking lots, paved trails – would be removed. Throughout the year, all visitors would come to the park either by shuttle service from a transit center in the vicinity of Highway 1/Interstate 101, or under their own power. Only a small parking area would be available for accessibility. The park entrance would be relocated to the current lower parking lot and designed to accommodate a modest transit stop for the shuttle. It would also provide basic visitor services. The Muir Woods Inn and adjacent area would be used for administration and limited park operations. The existing main entrance area, including the entire upper parking area, restrooms, and visitor center, as well as a major portion of the lower parking lot, would be removed to restore natural conditions, including seasonal flooding. 	<p>Same as Alt. 1</p>	
Marin County				
General		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transportation and multi-modal access to all park sites would be improved. 		
Stinson Beach		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The park would explore ways to improve visitor access to Stinson Beach, such as introducing seasonal alternative transportation, and would continue to work with the community to address congestion. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar to Alternative 1, the park managers would explore year round alternative transportation options in order to reduce congestion. 	
Highway 1& Panoramic Highway		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These park lands would be managed to enable visitors, traveling by car, bicycle, and transit, to enjoy spectacular views of the Pacific coast, and to provide access to park sites. The park would collaborate with Caltrans, Marin County, and other land managing agencies to improve the roadways for the safety and enjoyment of park visitors. New facilities could include overlooks, pull-offs with restrooms and interpretive exhibits, picnic areas, enhanced trail connections, and a unified wayfinding system. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> These park lands would be managed to enable visitors, traveling by car, bicycle, and transit, to enjoy spectacular views of the Pacific coast, and to provide access to park sites. In the event of a catastrophic landslide, park managers would encourage abandonment of Highway 1 	<p>Same as Alt. 1</p>

			between Muir Beach and Stinson Beach in the affected segment.	
Lower Redwood Creek (Banducci)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Park managers would work with Marin County and state parks to explore realignment of Franks Valley Road to reduce impacts to Redwood Creek. 	Same as Alt. 2
Golden Gate Dairy		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site improvements to accommodate a trailhead and public transit stop. . . 		
Tennessee Valley		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In collaboration with the community, park managers would work to bring transit and extend a multi-use trail to connect with the Mill Valley Bike Path (Bay Trail). 		
Alcatraz				
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The park would manage this area to accommodate ferry service to the island, boat tours around the island, and other forms of nonmotorized water-based recreation. The area adjacent to the entry pier would be managed to expand the capacity and range of uses that may occur. This would enable the island to be part of the San Francisco Bay Water Trail, welcoming nonmotorized boats via permits or reservations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As in Alternative 1, this area would be managed to accommodate ferry access to the island as well as some forms of water-based recreation. Enforcement of resource protection measures and visitor access regulations would be strengthened. For example, tours near the island would be regulated. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • . . . visitors could file aboard prison-themed ferries. • Park managers would re-institute the historic no trespass zone that was in place during previous periods and would recreate the feeling of exclusion and isolation. The zone would be demarcated by a line of historic buoys circling the island. Only approved vessels, like the visitor ferry, would be allowed to approach and use the island's dock.
San Francisco City/County				
General		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites would be connected to each other and to communities by the trails system and the City's transit and multi-modal access systems. 		
Upper Fort Mason	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning is underway to extend San Francisco's historic streetcar system through an existing tunnel to lower Fort Mason (the Fort Mason Center) and bring water shuttle access to a pier at lower Fort Mason. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to planned future water shuttle and historic streetcar access to lower Fort Mason, visitor access to Alcatraz from the historic Alcatraz pier (Pier 4) would be considered in this alternative. These proposals anticipate the extension of San Francisco's historic streetcar system through the Fort Mason tunnel to the Fort Mason Center and would require close collaboration with San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park and the City of San Francisco. 	Same as Alt. 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this alternative, tours to Alcatraz would leave from historic Pier 4 at the foot of Van Ness Avenue. McDowell Road would facilitate pedestrian and bicycle travel through Fort Mason and highlight scenic views of the Golden Gate and San Francisco Bay. As in alternative 1, these proposals anticipate the extension of the historic streetcar through the Fort Mason tunnel to the Fort Mason Center and would require close collaboration with San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park and the City

				of San Francisco.
Fort Miley		• Safe and more direct vehicle and trail access to East Fort Miley would be developed to better support its future use and preservation.	Same as Alt. 1	
San Mateo County				
General		• . . . this alternative would focus on the importance of improving access and community engagement in GGNRA's park lands.		• . . . park managers would work with communities between Pacifica and Santa Cruz to support the National Scenic Byway designation of the Pacific Coast Highway (Hwy 1) .
Sheldance Nursery Area		• Access from Highway 1 would be improved.	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 1
Montara Lighthouse		• Access from Highway 1 would be improved.	Same as Alt. 1	Same as Alt. 1

Data Source:

- Bulleted items = text taken directly from GMP alternatives (Newsletter 4, Spring 2008).

Bolded items in text added for emphasis and to call out primary actions.

Park-wide Transportation Mission & Goals (drafted and submitted for discussion by Alexa Viets on 7/10/08)

Transportation Mission:

Link a system of open spaces spanning three counties through collaboration with regional partners. Create equitable and convenient multimodal transportation options which are enjoyable and welcoming for all visitors.

System Goals:

- Transit systems should be fully accessible, easy to use and integrated with the overall transportation network for the Bay Area.
- Transportation facilities should be sited and designed to support a full range of modes, to maximize safety for all users, and to co-locate with other visitor support facilities.
- Reduce user conflicts, through design, communication and policy, as appropriate to ensure safe access for all users.
- Seek efficiency and interconnection of park infrastructure investments to the larger Bay Area by participating in the regional dialog, planning and design process for transportation systems.
- Reduce visitor and employee congestion through a full range of demand management tools, such as parking management, event planning, and alternative work schedules, and other best practices as they develop.

Suggested Notes for San Mateo

Over the next 10-20 years, as the regional connections to and recreational use of open space in San Mateo grows, I think we should consider inclusion of a vision in the overview sections regarding access. Here are my thoughts for some “placeholder” language:

Alt 1: (add to end of 3rd paragraph) Coordinate with local and county transit planning to provide multimodal access to trailheads in the future.

Alt 2: (add to end of 4th paragraph) Trailhead parking development will be kept to a minimum with preference given to connecting to local/regional transit as an alternative.

Alt 3: (add to end of 3rd paragraph) Any future development of scenic pull-outs or parking at trailheads would be developed in a sensitive manner and to accommodate future multi-modal access.

Two General Questions:

The 1980 GMP laid out a strong vision for water connections, should this next iteration of the GMP continue to support those on-going efforts into the future beyond just the statement, “support the SF Bay Water Trail.”

Skyline Blvd. seems to create both a barrier and at a few locations a route for access to the San Mateo parks from communities on the east side of the Peninsula. As we look into the crystal ball, I can imagine this cross-hwy access and congestion at Skyline Blvd trailheads will also be an issue. Perhaps, our San Mateo vision needs to consider east-west connections to parkland a Skyline Drive?